U-43
P9935

30-3-

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Princeton, N. J.

From the Rev. W. B. SPRAGUE, D.D. Sept. 1839.

Rare

Case, Division
Shelf, Section
Book, No.

SCC
1329

A N

Impartial VIEW

Of the Principal

DIFFICULTIES

THAT

Affect the *Trinitarian*, or clog the *Arian*,

SCHEME.

Wherein, among other things, that important *Quære*, whether OUR LORD is to be worship'd as Mediator, is fairly discussed.

AND

The Tendency of each *Doctrine*, to heighten Morality, and promote the Life, Purity, and Beauty of Religion, fully consider'd, *&c.*

CONTAINING

An ANSWER to Mr. *Forster's* Appendix, *&c.* and to a Pamphlet, entituled, *The Unity of* GOD *not inconsistent with the Divinity of* CHRIST.

AS ALSO

Some Remarks on the Reply to Dr. Waterland.

WITH

An INTRODUCTION concerning the true State of the Controversy. In a Letter to a Friend.

By JOSEPH PYKE.

Prove all things: Hold fast that which is good. 1 Thess. v. 21.

LONDON:

Printed for AARON WARD, at the *King's-Arms* in *Little-Britain.* MDCCXXI.

THE

INTRODUCTION:

IN A

LETTER

TO A

FRIEND.

Concerning the

True State of the CONTROVERSY.

DEAR SIR,

THE *Genius and Temper of our Religion is calm and meek, like its* kind *Author; it inſtructs us in all the ſweet Meaſures of* Charity *and good Will, in all the winning Arts of true Addreſs; it recommends no other* Method *to convince* Gainſayers, *but the Soundneſs of its Doctrine, and the Lenity of its Inſtructions, with a* becoming

Earneſtneſs in contending for the Faith; *and thus to argue with a* kindly *Heat, by the dint of Reaſon; or, if poſſible, to ſtrike home* Conviction *by the Edge* of Scripture, *is agreeable to the* ſofteſt *Paſſions of humane Nature, as well as* approv'd *by the ſacred Writings: But to indulge to keen Raillery, black Invective, and fiery Perſecution, the* miſhapen Offſpring *of Ignorance, Peeviſhneſs, and Bigotry, blemiſhes the* Purity *of the Chriſtian Religion, and ſtains the Beauty of the* Proteſtant *Faith; inſtead of opening the Eyes of thoſe we aim to inſtruct, or convince, it throws a thick Miſt of* Prejudice *before them, and ſo has a direct Tendency to ſteel them in their Errors; for Truth always appears moſt amiable and comely, when left to its* native Plainneſs, *and needs no Strains of Satyr,* no penal Laws, *no Engines of Torture to enforce the Belief of it; but its own* Strength and Charm *is enough to recommend it to the Impartial.*

Animated with a feeling Concern for the ſinking Honours of the dear Redeemer God, and a tender Regard to the Peace, Welfare, and Worſhip of the Churches of Chriſt, as well as a fervent Deſire that Truth may prevail, and your Soul proſper in the Knowledge of him, whom to know is Life eternal; *I ſhall, without any Doublings or Diſguiſes, with all the Warmth and Force of Argument poſſible, without breaking in upon the*

Rules

Rules of Decorum and good Humour, ſtrenuouſly eſſay a Refutation of thoſe pernicious Principles that are now become the Darlings of the preſent Age. Theſe ſhocking Doctrines, which were long ſince baffled, being again revived and recommended by Men of great Name and Figure in the learned World, may the more eaſily creep upon the unguarded, *and ſo unhinge all their Thoughts, and ſpread univerſal Confuſion on their Minds. This I know hath been the* melancholy Caſe *of ſome, ſurprizing* Doubts *have broken in upon their Peace, impoveriſhed their religious Joys, and even unſettled their Faith in the great Propitiation; a ſore Trial in this Day of Gloom, to know not where to fix for ſolid and ſteddy Hope of Salvation! but ſtill fluctuating and wavering, ſuſpecting and being ſuſpected; if but one of thoſe, whoſe Thoughts are thus miſerably confus'd and unſettled, may receive any Help to compoſe their flutter'd Spirits, by the following Eſſay, which I can truly ſay is my ſincere Aim, and the firſt Spring that put my Pen in Motion, I am perſuaded it muſt be a ſufficient Apology for me, in the Eye of all who can indulge to free and generous Sentiments. A fair and faithful Diſcharge of ſo important an Undertaking, you muſt, Sir, be ſenſible, requires the utmoſt Care and Caution: And therefore I conceive, it will not be amiſs to lead you, and every other candid Reader, into a View of the State of the Contro-*

verſy, before I enter into the Heart of it, by laying down a few neceſſary Premiſes.

Firſt, *In Enquiries of this Nature, our Thoughts and Pens ſhould not be ſuffer'd to range beyond the Limits of the* inſpired *Writings, and what ariſes by neceſſary Connection thence.*

Here we ſhould fix our footing; for the Manner *of God's Exiſtence, the* eternal Generation *of his only Son,* &c. *are very nice and tender Points, and ſhould be manag'd with the utmoſt Regard to what is reveal'd, leaſt we too curiouſly pry into the Secrets of Deity, and give a Looſe to our Thoughts to rove beyond all the* Bounds *of Decency and ſtrict Duty; which may perhaps lead us to imbibe Notions that are by no means compatible to the divine Being; whereas, if we faithfully adher'd to the* divine Teſtimony *alone, 'twould be a happy Means to reſcue our Minds from many perplexing Doubts, which otherwiſe they muſt neceſſarily labour under. For,*

Secondly, *'Tis rational to ſuppoſe that God may reveal ſome things, the Natures, Reaſons, Circumſtances, and Modes of which can't be brought down to the Level of our weak Underſtandings.*

That God is an infinite and incomprehenſible Being, is a Propoſition that no wiſe Man will cavil at; for could we fully graſp the divine Nature and Perfections, he muſt ceaſe to be

what

what he is: Which easy and universal Concession *should, methinks, byas all humble Enquirers, who believe God to be infinitely wise, and acknowledge his Sovereignty over them, chearfully to acquiesce in the Discoveries he has made of himself (who perfectly knows his own Nature, and as he is Truth itself, 'tis impossible he should deceive us;) for being infinitely wise, he may reveal things far above the Reach of our feeble Capacities; and as he is the supreme Lord and Governor of the World, our Lawgiver, he may certainly, for the Trial of our Obedience and Submission, command us to entertain them, as the greatest Truths, tho' we may not be able to trace any clear and distinct Connection, between what is reveal'd, and our common ordinary Notions of things. Therefore,*

Thirdly, *Should we deny our Assent, till we fully understood the Manner* how *to reconcile all the Difficulties of Revelation, we must discard the Testimony of him who cannot lye, and so quite reject all divine Faith, as useless, trivial, and unnecessary.*

Faith, strictly taken, is nothing else but an Assent to the Truth of any Proposition, upon the Credit of him or them that deliver it. So that to see things in their own Light and Evidence, is not properly *believing, it being necessary to the very Nature of Faith, that the* Credit *of the Testimony*

timony be the Reaſon of our Aſſent. Conſequently, if I deny my Aſſent to any Propoſition, which is reveal'd by God, becauſe I have no clear Idea of its Connection with preconceiv'd Notions, I ſlight his Authority and Veracity, which is the only Ground *of my Aſſent in this Caſe; for though I have a general Knowledge of what is to be believ'd, before I can aſſent to it, which is convey'd to me by the Teſtimony of God, in his Word, concerning any particular Propoſition: This is far from being comprehenſive; for had I a perfect and adæquate Knowledge of it, there would remain nothing of it unknown, to be teſtify'd or received as a Matter of Faith; and then my Aſſent to any Truth would not be due to the divine Teſtimony alone, but to ſuch other Evidences as are entirely* foreign *to the Notion of Faith, and ſubverſive of it. Hence*

Fourthly, *It appears, that the Difference between Matters of Science and Faith, is not that we can't be at all certain of the latter as well as the former; but only that our Knowledge is leſs diſtinct and clear, for Certainty depends on the divine Teſtimony; and therefore what we know God has reveal'd, ſhould be receiv'd as Truth, with the ſame Readineſs of Mind, as if we ſaw the very Manner how 'twas, and could demonſtrate it in every particular.*

By Certainty here, I can mean no more than a firm and rational Perſuaſion of the Truth of any Propoſition founded on ſuch a plain Evidence, as can admit of no juſt Cauſe for demur, or doubting, by thoſe who are unprejudic'd, and capable of exerciſing their Reaſon; for 'twould be extravagant in a wiſe Man, to expect pure Demonſtration, and Mathematical Evidence, in any Propoſition that depends on Teſtimony, whether Humane or Divine; for tho' it may be indubitable, there is no Neceſſity, that, like a Propoſition in Euclid, *it ſhould be neceſſarily true or falſe, as affirm'd or deny'd, or elſe imply a Contradiction in Terms: Allowing then, that this latter kind of Certainty be ſtyl'd infallible, and let an ingenious, but haſty Author, have what he contends for, that there is no Certainty but what is infallible, ſuch a Conceſſion can be of no Detriment to the* Honour *of reveal'd Religion, or any Branch of it; much leſs give any juſt Occaſion to cenſure thoſe (if their Meaning be underſtood) who ſay there may be Certainty where there is not Infallibility; for I apprehend all that any can deſign by this Expreſſion, as they have regard to ſubjective Certainty only, is, that there may be an undoubted well-grounded Perſuaſion of a Truth, where there is not infallible Perſuaſion: And this ſeems to be the Meaning of the*

London

London *Miniſters in their Introduction*, * *however miſrepreſented, as their own Words ſhew*: And none can deny this, unleſs they will venture to aſſert, that we can in no caſe know we are in the right, but by being aſſur'd that it is impoſſible for us in any caſe to be in the wrong, *&c. Now what purpoſe can it ſerve, to faſten a Meaning upon the Words of others they did not dream of? Or to ſcuffle about the uſe of a Term when our Ideas are the ſame, tho' they may be cloathed in different Expreſſions? For Scripture Truths, in the Nature and Reaſon of Things, can bear no other Proof than what is fetch'd from Teſtimony; and ſuppoſe the Witneſſes qualify'd with ſuitable Abilities and Integrity, we ought in all Reaſon to acquieſce in the Evidence, beyond which ſtronger could not be deſired, ſuppoſing the objective Certainty, or the real Exiſtence of the thing teſtify'd as an Object of Belief ever ſo true and infallible: If we deny this, we muſt ſay nothing is to be believ'd, but what hath the higheſt Evidence poſſible*, i. e. *which lies ſo open, clear, and diſtinct to the Underſtanding, that every one, tho' never ſo much prepoſſeſs'd, muſt irreſiſtibly aſſent. At this rate* (*as Biſhop* Wilkins *obſerves*) there would be no room left for the Freedom of our Obedience, nor

* Page 5.

nor consequently, any Grounds for Reward or Punishment, which belongs to free Actions, not to such as are necessary *and forc'd.* † *But if we were under an unavoidable Necessity to believe the Doctrine of the Son of God, even as much as we are forc'd to assent to this Proposition, that one and two make three, or the like, our Consent would be equally* constrain'd *and extorted, and then we must be all exactly of one Mind, and every one that has heard of the* Christian *Religion, must unanimously, and without the least Reluctance, embrace it, which is false in fact. But supposing such an infallible Certainty attainable, there would appear no Occasion for it, seeing if divine Truths are propos'd with that Evidence, as every one of a teachable Disposition can safely and voluntarily assent to them, without any just and tolerable Grounds for doubting; this is sufficient to establish such a Certainty, as may guard against all the Cavils of Infidelity, Scepticism, and Burlesque. And let Men call this Certainty, or unquestionable, indubitable, just Persuasion, 'tis not very material; 'tis what all along has not been improperly call'd* moral Certainty, *which if rejected, every thing in the World that depends on Testimony must be look'd upon as precarious, uncertain, and doubtful, and so our Minds*

† Of Natural Religion, pag. 30, 31.

Minds must be in perpetual Agitation and Suspence about almost every thing, and no Assent can be given but to what is self-evident, or what I see with my own Eyes; and consequently Faith is no more Faith; but our Lord tells us, Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed. *

Fifthly, *Such a Certainty as this can by no Means border on* Enthusiasm, *it being attain'd by the use of rational Deduction, and our Assent to those Truths, of which we have no Cause to doubt, being approv'd by the strictest Reason.*

Before we can assent to any reveal'd Proposition, we must consider whether the Scriptures are of a divine Extract; or whether spurious and counterfeit. Being once satisfied of their heavenly Original, and sacred Authority, we must next, as to any particular Truth, enquire whether 'tis actually reveal'd in these Writings, or no: For, possibly, some may pretend that to be a Doctrine of express Revelation which is only the Fruit of a towring *Fancy, or their own false and incoherent Inferences. But after all, when, by the utmost Stretch of rational Enquiry, we have endeavoured to find out what is divine Truth, determined its genuine Meaning by all the* just Laws *of Interpretation, and are thoroughly convinced of its true*

* John xx. 29.

true Sense; 'tis then I conceive the highest Improvement of Reason, the Glory of it readily to comply, seeing whatever God has reveal'd must be true. Should we now reject what we know is reveal'd by him, only because 'tis above our Comprehension, we should run into particular Whimsies, and false Conjectures of our own hatching, which looks frightful in those that call themselves Masters of Reason: For all the World must own, that a thing may certainly be, and we may know it to be, which yet we know not how it should be. And consequently, Sir, though I should not be able to resolve all your Doubts concerning this sublime Subject before us, by rendring it in every respect obvious to your Conceptions, as 'tis no Stain to our Character, that we are but Creatures, and have not infinite Capacities, I may venture to say, 'twould be no Impeachment of our Wisdom and Prudence to embrace the great Doctrines of Christianity in their Simplicity, i. e. as purely reveal'd: For 'tis no wonder if a supernatural Revelation speaks incomprehensible things of God, who is infinitely exalted above all the most elevated Screws of Thought; and therefore the common Maxims of Philosophy, the imperfect Measure even of finite Beings, are not rashly to be extended to him, unless we perfectly knew his divine Nature, and how to apply them. But here we are soon grovel'd

how

how dim is our Knowledge of the Most High! The brightest Idea we can form of God is vastly, infinitely inferior to him, which should check all hasty *Conclusions concerning his peerless Majesty, whose Manner of Existence far exceeds the Fathom of created Intellects. Now as the Doctrine of the Son's eternal Generation is purely reveal'd, being undiscoverable by the Light of Reason, I conceive your Friend advanced a Step too far, when in his Appendix he attempts to reduce it to a* direct and flat Contradiction. *For my part, I can pretend to offer nothing in the whole Compass of Nature that shall give you a suitable Resemblance of the* Mystery, *so as to assist you in conceiving it, or me in describing it any further, than that 'tis reveal'd, and may be possible, as far as we know; and if what we don't know to be impossible, and all the World by their* utmost *Skill and Art can't prove to be a Contradiction, appears to be testify'd by any Person of* known *Integrity, of whose Veracity we can entertain no manner of Doubt, we can't with any just Reason refuse to give our Assent. And since the Veracity of God admits of no Question, and we on both sides of this Controversy concur to* centre *in the Holy Scriptures, as the only* Rule of Faith, *as well as Manners; if those Passages of sacred Writ, which may be produced to prove the Son of the same Nature, Glory, and Eternity with the Father, shall be ex-*

pounded

pounded with that Candour, Impartiality, and Fidelity, as not to be wreſted, like the doubtful Oracles of the Heathen Deities, to any Senſe, and perverted to Meanings the Words can't bear, I flatter my ſelf there will be no juſt Cauſe of ſuſpending our Aſſent. If it ſhall be ſtill urged, that theſe Doctrines, of the Son's Generation, the Trinity, Incarnation, &c. can't be ſo explain'd as to be clear and adæquate, and level to our Capacities, and therefore muſt be rejected as abſurd, impoſſible, or contradictory; this can by no means follow, unleſs every thing is ſo that we cannot diſtinctly *conceive, and plainly account for; which is ſuch a degree of Folly and Scepticiſm, that I ſcarce believe* any *Man of ſtrong Senſe can be drawn into; for at this rate we muſt believe nothing, becauſe in fact we can fully comprehend nothing. So that I heartily wiſh your Friend had not engroſs'd ſo prodigious a Share of the reaſoning Talent to himſelf and Party as he ſeems to do, by caſting that Glance of Reproach on his* orthodox Brethren, *as* Men of more Zeal than Judgment. *What follows is a little more harſh and unguarded, which ſurprizes me to ſee one of his Complexion and Moderation, ſit ſo hard upon the Characters of others, and poſitively determine at the firſt Start againſt a Doctrine ſo ſublime and important; as if the great* Jehovah *was ſuch a thin and ſhallow Being, as preſently to be ſeen*

thro'

thro' and thro'. Alas, we are all but of Yesterday, and know nothing; how then can we speak so definitively of a Being who dwells in impenetrable Light, and whose Dignity transcends the Reach of Mortals? 'Twill be no Excuse to plead we know not how to reconcile *our Ideas about what he has reveal'd concerning himself with any of our natural Notions; for if we would demonstrate it to be a Contradiction, we must know that it can't be reconcil'd to his own divine Nature. But we may as well grasp the Sun, and span the whole Circuit of the Heavens, as measure the divine Nature by our shallow Apprehensions; so that your Friend has need of some candid and favourable Allowances in this Particular, and probably 'twas only his Fondness for his own Opinions that led him unawares to these* wild *Excursions; and when I come to feel the Edge of his Arguments, I hope you'll discern he had no such Bottom to proceed on as he imagin'd; and that the Doctrine of the Son's eternal Generation hath no Contradiction in it, but only in his manner of conceiving it.*

To confirm you in the Belief of the Divinity of the Son of God, which is certainly the Beauty, Glory, and Foundation of the Christian Religion, and to obviate, if possible, some Difficulties that may be thrown in your Way, I have not only consider'd what Mr. Forster *has too precipitantly urg'd*

urg'd againſt it in his Appendix, but attempted ſome Remarks on a late Pamphlet wrongly entituled, The Unity of God not inconſiſtent with the Divinity of Chriſt; *both which I have interwoven in the following Treatiſe, with no other View than to place the Controverſy in a more eaſy Light. Since I finiſh'd my Deſign, this Author's Reply to* Dr. Waterland's *Preface came to hand; his juſt Reflections on the bitter way of handling Controverſy among Chriſtian Divines, with that Air of Concern and Grief he ſhews on this Occaſion, and the great Streſs he lays upon his following Pages, had very much rais'd my Expectations of finding nothing elſe but ſoft Words, eaſy Periods, and ſolid Arguments: But I was diſappointed, and the more ſurpriz'd at it, to ſee a Gentleman ſo ſoon forget his own Rules, and practiſe an Art he had juſt condemn'd, of raiſing the Paſſions of his Readers,* and gaining their Aſſent (*to uſe his own Words*) by the low and unworthy Methods of Poſitiveneſs, Dictating, Contempt, and Miſrepreſentation.* *Inſtances of all which might eaſily be given, but I would forbear whetting; my Deſign being not to recriminate, but to plead for the Truth as 'tis in* Jeſus. *The Method I have purſu'd in it may perhaps appear a little intricate; and therefore I*

 have

* Reply, pag. 1.

have digeſted it into ſeveral diſtinct Chapters, for the greater Eaſe of the Reader. If any thing that I have offer'd may have a Tendency to eſtabliſh you in the Faith of the Goſpel, promote your Peace, Comfort, and Joy, in our common Lord, and prevent others from running into the endleſs Mazes of Error, to the Diſparagement of Chriſtianity, and the real Encouragement of Deiſm and Irreligion, the Conſequences of which are threatning and dreadful! Let God alone have all the Glory, whilſt you forget not to remember me at the Throne of Grace, who am, and ſhall ſtill remain

Your unfeigned Friend and Servant,

Warminſter,
June 29, 1721.

JOSEPH PYKE.

AN

Impartial VIEW

Of the Principal

DIFFICULTIES

THAT

Affect the *Trinitarian*, or clog the *Arian*,

SCHEME.

CHAP. I.

The first Argument for the Eternal Generation of the Son of God, as stated in the Appendix, viz. That when *Christ* is called the Son of God, in that Phrase is imply'd his being of the same numerical Nature and Essence with God, * *briefly considered, and the Objections against it remov'd: With Dr.* Waterland's *Account of the Word* Person, *rescued from the Charge of a Contradiction levell'd against him by the Author of Unity.*

WHEN 'tis written, *God so loved the World that he gave his only begotten Son,* &c. † And *in this was manifest the Love of God towards us, that God sent his only begotten Son into the World that we might live through him:* If we compare these Words with

* Appendix to Essay on Fundamentals, pag. 34.
† Joh. iii. 16. 1 Joh. iv. 9. Col. i. 13, 16. 1 Joh. v. 20. &c.

other Paſſages of Sacred Writ, it apparently ſhews there was a Relation between him and his Father; not only before his being ſent into the World in the Fullneſs of Time, but even antecedent to the Creation itſelf, which muſt render it a fruitleſs Taſk in any one to eſſay a Proof of his being denominated a Son from his miraculous Conception by the Holy Ghoſt, his Office of Meſſiah, his Adoption, Reſurrection from the Dead, or any other Reaſon that can poſſibly be aſſign'd; unleſs it be his being begotten from Everlaſting in the one Godhead, or divine Nature; in reſpect of which he is truly and really Son of God, as much as in reſpect of his humane Nature he is Son of Man. Agreeable to which the Scriptures call him the *Root* and *Offspring*, the *Lord* and *Son of David*; * and when 'tis ſaid God ſpar'd not his own Son, ἰδίᾳ υἱῷ ἐκ ἐφείσατο, his *proper* Son, it plainly ſuppoſes he was before all Ages begotten of His Father, which very eaſily and naturally leads us to apprehend the divine Relation between the Father and the Son to be neceſſary and eternal; for if the Father is eternal, then the Son is eternal, and always a Son; for Relatives muſt be mutual and coæval; ſo that the Father can be no more without the Son, than the Son without the Father, the Relation being inſeparable. This relative Diſtinction aſſures us however, that the Father is not the Son (which is a ſtrong Proof of more Perſons in the Godhead than one), for the ſame Perſon in the ſame reſpects cannot be Father and Son too; cannot beget and be begotten. And further, as our bleſſed Lord is an eternal Son, of the ſame Nature with the Father, as every true Son partakes of the common humane Nature with his Parent, he muſt be God in Eſſence, equal to the Father, and conſequently muſt have the ſame Eſſence, Power, Will, and Glory: For we may ſafely aſſert, that God did not beget another God, diſtinct

* Rev. xxii. 16. Matt. xxii. 45. Rom. viii. 32.

distinct and separate from himself, and inferior to him, though he begat a Son; for the Power of God is not, (and with humble and awful Deference to the divine Majesty) we may say cannot be exercised about any thing repugnant, and contradictory to his own Nature; and as nothing is more repugnant to the Godhead than a Plurality of Gods, therefore we conclude, that the Father and Son are one in Essence, &c. I here wave the Term *Numerical*, till 'tis explained, for Number being only in Strictness of Speech applicable to compound Beings, it may perhaps be used improperly in this case; seeing God, *absolutely* considered, is one, exclusive of every other Being; however, if all that be meant by the Word *Numerical* is to exclude a *separate and different Essence*, I conceive it may be safely used; and in this Sense, wherever the Word occurs, I desire the Reader to take it. In thus stating the Subject I have done it more Justice than probably the Author's design'd Brevity would permit him to do; I shall now pursue the Argument, and impartially try the Weight of his Objections against it. The Argument in the Appendix stands thus:

"Every proper, natural Son is of the same Nature "with his Father who begat him; if then Christ be "the true and natural Son of God, he must have the "same Essence with God, and be, in the highest Sense "of the Word, God."

The Author's Reply to this, is;

But now if this Argument proves any thing, it proves more than they would desire, viz. *That Christ being the proper and natural Son of God must have a really distinct Nature from God, though specifically the same, as every Son has a really distinct Nature from his Father, who begat him, though suppos'd to be specifically the same.**

To obviate this seeming Difficulty, I offer this Plea, which all Men, not bigotted to an Hypothesis, must

* Essay on Fundamentals, pag. 34, 35.

account just and valid, *viz.* That there is no strict and *decisive* arguing from a finite to an infinite Nature, because there is no Parallel, or Analogy between them; and consequently, tho' a Father and a Son among Men have as it were distinct and separate Natures, as well as Persons, the uncreated Son of God may notwithstanding have one undivided Nature with his Father.

Those Principles which are true of finite Beings cannot always, with any Reason and Propriety, be prædicated of the infinite *Jehovah*; for though it should be undeniable, that Persons of the same Species, as a Father and Son among us, have *each* a distinct Nature as well as Subsistence, it don't at all touch the Argument, much less enervate it: For the humane Nature, which is common to all the Species (in which respect it may be call'd one) cannot be communicated to several proper Persons of the same Species, without a *Dispersion* of the common Nature, and a Multiplication of it, into several, singular, particular Natures, which the humane Nature we may allow will admit of, seeing 'tis imperfect, finite, and divisible. But hence to infer, that Christ, as the natural Son of God, must have a *real, distinct Nature from God, though specifically the same, as every Son has a distinct Nature from his Father*, is forc'd and preposterous; for the divine Nature is infinite, and that which is infinite can neither be divided nor multiplied. This Argument is nervously prosecuted by the great Bishop *Pearson*, † whose Words, as they may cast a better Light upon the Subject, I shall transcribe.

" The Similitude then, in which the Propriety of " Generation is preserved, is that which consisteth in " the Identity of Nature; and this Communication of " the divine Essence by the Father to the Word, is " evidently a sufficient Foundation of such a Similitude; " from whence Christ is called * the Image of God,

" the

† On the Creed, pag. 137. * 2 Cor. iv. 4. Heb. i. 3.

" the Brightneſs of his Glory, and the expreſs Image of " his Perſon. Nor is this Communication of the di- " vine Eſſence only the proper Generation of the Son ; " but we muſt acknowledge it far more proper than any " natural Generation of the Creature, not only becauſe " it is in a more perfect manner, but alſo becauſe the " Identity of Nature is more perfect. As in the divine " Eſſence we acknowledge all the Perfections of the " Creatures, ſubſtracting all the Imperfections which " adhere unto them here in things below ; ſo in the " Communication we muſt look upon the Reality, " without any kind of Defect, Blemiſh, or Impurity. " In humane Generation the Son is begotten in the " ſame Nature with the Father, which is performed by " Derivation, or Deciſion of part of the Subſtance of " the Parent : But this Deciſion includeth Imperfection, " becauſe it ſuppoſeth a Subſtance diviſible, and conſe- " quently corporeal, whereas the Eſſence of God is in- " corporeal, ſpiritual, and indiviſible ; and therefore " his Nature is really communicated, not by Derivation " or Deciſion, but by a total and plenary Communication ; " in natural Conceptions the Father neceſſarily precedeth " the Son, and begetteth one younger than himſelf ; for " being Generation is for the Perpetuity of the Species, " where the Individuals ſucceſſively fail, it is ſufficient " if the Parent can produce another to live after him, " and continue the Exiſtence of his Nature, when his " Perſon is diſſolv'd. But this preſuppoſeth the Imper- " fection of Mortality wholly to be remov'd, when we " ſpeak of him that inhabiteth Eternity : The Eſſence " which God always had without beginning, without " beginning he did communicate, being always Father, " as always God. —— And that which is moſt remark- " able in humane Generations, the Son is of the ſame " Nature with the Father, and yet he is not the ſame " Man ; becauſe though he hath an Eſſence of the *ſame* " *kind*, yet he hath not the *ſame Eſſence*, the Power of

" Generation depending on the firſt prolifical Bene-
" diction, Increaſe, and Multiply, it muſt be made
" by way of Multiplication; and thus every Son be-
" comes another Man; but the divine Eſſence being,
" by reaſon of its Simplicity, not ſubject to Diviſion,
" and in reſpect of its Infinity, uncapable of Multipli-
" cation, is ſo communicated as not to be multiplied;
" inſomuch that he who proceedeth by that Commu-
" nication hath not only the ſame Nature, but is the
" ſame God."

The ſame numerical whole undivided Nature then (if it be proper to ſay the Whole of that which hath no Parts) being of boundleſs Perfection, doth really and eternally belong to the Son of God, without any Diviſion of the divine Nature, or Separation of the Perſons from it; and conſequently, tho' the Perſons are diſtinguiſh'd into Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, they are not divided; yea, ſtrictly ſpeaking, the divine Nature itſelf, as 'tis common to Father and Son, *&c.* is not diſtinguiſh'd; for obſerve, " the divine Eſſence is not " diſtinguiſh'd from it ſelf, nor are the Perſons diſtin-
" guiſh'd from one another by the eſſential Properties of
" the Deity, but by perſonal Properties, which are not
" common to Father and Son," as you will ſee hereafter. Since then the one infinite and perfect Nature is common to the Father and Son, without any Diviſion or Separation, as in the humane Nature, they may be one God in a moſt conſummate Union; and conſequently the Argument produced by the Trinitarians, from the *Identity of Nature*, to prove the Equality of the Father and Son, does not prove *too much*, as our Author fancies, and would drill his Reader into the Belief of, by patching up a looſe Objection from what is only obſervable in *humane Generations*, which is eaſily refuted, not with the Trouble of denying it, but only by bare diſtinguiſhing between Natures finite and infinite, which have no exact Agreement one with the other, but between which

there

there is just the same inconceivable Distance, as between the meanest Worm and the great Creator; and if our Conceptions were any way suitable to the Nature of God, and not taken up from what we see among Men, we should be forc'd to think so.

Thus have I shewn, that the Argument does not prove too much, but just what it should prove, *viz.* that whatever the Father is, as he is God, the same is the Son, truly equally God, in one undivided Godhead. If the Author had been thoroughly aware of this, he could not have suggested, That *the Argument was destructive of the Unity of the Godhead, and advancing an Error worse than* Socinianism *itself, as being subversive of an acknowledg'd fundamental Principle of reveal'd Religion, the Unity of the Godhead.* *

In Reply to this,

Any one that has but dipp'd in the Controversy, must needs know that 'tis the receiv'd Doctrine of the Trinitarians, that there is but one Jehovah, one divine Nature, which is *undivided* in every of the Three Persons, and therefore every one of them is the true God (besides which Essence, whatsoever exists is a *Creature*, and not God;) for the divine Nature being immense and indivisible, the same intire Nature (to use the Bishop's Phrase) is communicated to the Son; † so that there is neither more nor less of Godhead in the Son, than in the Father or Holy Ghost, but all three divine Persons

---

* Appendix, pag. 35.

† The use of the Word *Communicate* has disgusted some, and led others unhappily to surmise, that what is communicated is deriv'd, and consequently the Son can't be the supreme God; whereas nothing else is meant by the Phrase, than to express the Order of the uncreated Persons subsisting in the divine Nature, according to humane Conception; and if we always carried in our Minds the Idea of its being eternal and necessary, it would shew us, that though the Word may be improper, yet can have no such Sense justly tax'd to it, as to give occasion for such a Suggestion, seeing the Father never gave, or the Son receiv'd, any thing but what they both everlastingly possess'd together in the one undivided Godhead.

ſons are equal in Subſtance, Power, and Glory, and conſequently the one God. But here ſome may imagine an invincible Difficulty occurs, *how can this Hypotheſis be prov'd to be conſiſtent with the Unity of God, when it appears beyond diſpute to be incomprehenſible, if not contradictory?* But tho' we may be ignorant how and in what manner 'tis conſiſtent, this ought to be no bar to our Belief of what we know is reveal'd, ſeeing 'tis neceſſary in the reaſon of things, that a Truth of this nature ſhould be ſublime and above our reach; for 'tis impoſſible that what is infinite ſhould be comprehended by a finite Mind; and tho' it be thus inſcrutable, it can never, by the moſt ſubtle Fetches, be fairly demonſtrated to be a Contradiction: Which very naturally leads me to animadvert a little upon the Author of *Unity*,† for charging Dr. *Waterland* with a Contradiction in his Notion of Perſon.

The Doctor's Words are, "Each divine Perſon is an "individual, intelligent Agent; but *as ſubſiſting in one* "*undivided Subſtance*, they are all together in that re- "ſpect but one undivided intelligent Agent."†† Every unprejudic'd Perſon, that attends to the Deſign of theſe Words, muſt ſee them very conſiſtent, and well guarded, and far from a Contradiction. The Terms *individual* and *undivided*, admitting of a ſtricter and larger Senſe, as differently applied, as the Doctor obſerves for himſelf in his Preface: To which I add, had he aſſerted that three individual Beings of eternal *ſeparate* Exiſtence are one undivided God; or that three individual infinite *ſeparate* Perſons are *one* Perſon, it would be a manifeſt Contradiction; for their being ſeparate muſt ſuppoſe them to be finite, &c. But on the contrary, the Doctor conſiders the divine Perſons not as *ſeparate*, but *as ſubſiſting in one undivided Subſtance*. Theſe Words, which determin'd the meaning of the whole Sentence, the Author having

† Unity, p. 5. †† Defence of ſome Queries, p. 350.

having left out, ſnatches an Opportunity to make the Doctor ſay what he pleaſes, *viz. three Agents are one Agent, or three Perſons are one Perſon, they are three, but one in the ſame reſpect.* What, ſuch Treatment, ſuch maiming of the Doctor's Words and Senſe, by one, that with ſuch Pain and Uneaſineſs is forc'd to complain of Miſrepreſentation? But the Author is ſo good as to palliate it in the next Words: "*Indeed* (ſays he) *the Doctor in-*"*ſerts a Clauſe which he ſeem'd to deſign as a Salvo, and to* "*obviate the Charge of a Contradiction.*" And this in fact does intirely remove it; for what is ſpoken of in *two different* reſpects, can't be true in *one* and *the ſame* reſpect. "The one reſpect, in which all three Perſons are con-"ſider'd as one undivided intelligent Agent, is as *they* "*ſubſiſt in one undivided Subſtance:*" Which Words the Author kept out of ſight above, as well knowing the honeſt Reader could diſcern no Contradiction, if they had not been ſuppreſs'd. As *to the other reſpect*, the Author queries, "*Muſt it not be as they do not ſubſiſt in* "*one undivided Subſtance? if it differs from the other, it muſt* "*be this.*" But why ſo poſitive, can they poſſibly differ in nothing elſe? may not their different manner of ſubſiſting in the divine Eſſence ſufficiently account for all the Doctor ſays? for it amounts to no more, than that three Perſons ſubſiſting after a different manner in the divine Eſſence, are not one Perſon, but one God; for no one of the three Perſons is conſider'd abſolutely as God, excluſive of the others; but they are all together one incomprehenſible uncreated Being; which is as far from a Contradiction, as 'tis from Tritheiſm, as I hope will be prov'd in the next Chapter: In the mean while 'tis worth remarking, that when Men launch beyond their Fathom, in queſt of unknown and unreveal'd Truths, 'tis no new thing to meet with inſuperable Difficulties to entangle them. What the Doctor meant, however, by his Notion of a Perſon, I am willing to ſuppoſe the Author underſtood, *unleſs he oppos'd he knew not what*; for

how

how could he assert it to be a Contradiction, unless he well understood what it was which he pretends to be a Contradiction? But notwithstanding this he calls upon the Doctor next of all, *to let us know what that is which is suppos'd to be the Medium between a Spirit and an Attribute*; and I in my turn summon him ever to prove the contrary; which if ever he should attempt, as he can't understand the deep things of God any more than the Doctor, I am sure he must talk *without a Meaning*. What he observes, indeed, *that where there is no Idea there can be no Assent*, is in part true, but not pertinent; for we all own that we must have a general Knowledge of what is to be believ'd (which, as I observ'd in the Introduction, we receive from the Word of God) before we can assent; because *assenting to nothing is the very same as not assenting*; but then to deny our Assent to the Truth of a Thing, or the Reality of its Existence, only because the Manner of its existing is unknown to us, which is the very Case, is most unreasonable. I may as well refuse to believe that God exists, till I can exactly explain how he exists; or deny that I think, because I know not how, or by what secret Springs of Motion my Thoughts are exerted. The Truth then of a Trinity may be known by the divine Testimony; and tho' there be unsurmountable Difficulties in conceiving or explaining the *Modus* or Manner how it *can be*, *this don't affect the Truth itself*, which is supported by too big and sacred an *Authority* to be weakned by what the Author *thinks* of it, has said of it, or can say, tho' he seems to entertain a Notion, that his calling the three Persons three Spirits, will bring the Controversy to an Issue; but if each of the three Persons in the Godhead may be call'd a Spirit, without subverting the Unity of the divine Nature, this will be of little Service to him, tho' it may puzzle and amuse others that don't see thro' the Fallacy.

CHAP.

CHAP. II.

An Enquiry whether any Idea can be juſtly fix'd on the Term Perſon, *ſo as* not *to deſtroy the Unity of the divine Nature; and whether, in any* qualify'd *Senſe,* each *of the three Perſons may be call'd a* Spirit.

THE Deſign of this Chapter is to vindicate the Trinitarian Scheme; to ſhew the Poſſibility of three Perſons ſubſiſting *in* one undivided Godhead, ſo as not to imply a Contradiction; that there may be a Medium between a Mode of Subſiſtence and a ſeparate Spirit; to confirm the Doctrine of the Unity of the divine Eſſence, which is ſo perfect, as not to be capable of ſuch a Difference of Perſons as is among Men, which will farther obviate the Author of *Unity*'s Charge of implying a Contradiction, and the Objection of the Appendix againſt it, as making three Gods.

Firſt, I ſhall try whether any Meaning can be fix'd on the Term *Perſon*, ſo as to obviate the Charge of a Contradiction.

Secondly, Whether this Meaning may be ſo conſiſtent with the Unity of the Godhead, as not neceſſarily to introduce three ſeparate Gods.

Thirdly, Whether in any Senſe each of the divine Perſons may be call'd a Spirit.

(1.) I ſhall humbly offer whether any Meaning can be fix'd on the Term *Perſon*, ſo as to obviate the Charge of

of a Contradiction; and in treating of this 'twill not be improper to hint two Extreams which some Persons have run into, that of *Sabellianism*, and suspected *Tritheism*.

First, The *Sabellians* held, that a Person was nothing else but a Name, Attribute, Power, or Operation in God, which, according to several Appearances, or Manifestations, was sometimes call'd Father, sometimes Son, and sometimes Holy Ghost, according to the *Character* that was sustain'd in the *Oeconomy* of our Salvation. This is an Hypothesis that accounts for the Unity of God; but as 'tis contrary to the whole Tenor of the inspir'd Oracles, it has been justly rejected by the Churches; and for the same Reason we ought to be shy of the Definition of some of the Schoolmen, who seem to describe a divine Person to be only a meer Mode of Being; which is too narrow and nice a Distinction to be safely admitted of; for if we abstract the Manner of Subsistence in our Description of a Person from the divine Nature, we shall take away real Divinity from the Person, and so describe a Trinity of Cyphers, without God or Godhead.

Secondly, Others, who are reckon'd *Tritheists*, describe a Person by a distinct, infinite, self-conscious Mind; which as it seems to carry the same Idea with it as God, there cannot be three Persons according to this Definition, without supposing three Gods. But I conceive some of our modern Writers, how unhappy soever in their Explications of the Trinity, are not rashly to be censur'd as Tritheists, whilst *they hold an undivided Nature* and a mutual Consciousness; for in treating of such sublime Points, Men want Words to express their confus'd Ideas (and so are led to pitch upon a new Set of Terms, which seems to convey a new Sense, but in reality they design'd nothing new by it) for it must be confess'd an arduous Task to fix any such Meaning on the Word Person, as may answer the distinct personal Acts attributed to Father,

ther, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, in Scripture, and be not at the ſame time inconſiſtent with the Unity of the divine Nature, ſuch as may guard againſt real Tritheiſm, and not throw us into Sabellianiſm, and the unintelligible Jargon and Chaos of Metaphyſicks.

But tho' 'tis ſo difficult to aſſign what a divine Perſon in the Trinity is, an Eſſay towards it, that does not exceed the Bounds of modeſt Enquiry, I apprehend is neither unlawful nor unneceſſary; and therefore I would venture to repreſent my Thoughts of it in the following Words.

A ſpiritual infinite intelligent Agent, which muſt not be conſider'd as abſtracted from, but as truly ſubſiſting in the divine Nature, and as mutually, eternally, and inſeparably related to the other co-eſſential Perſons in the Godhead, from whom he is *ſufficiently* and only diſtinguiſh'd, by ſome perſonal, and as ſuch incommunicable Properties.

(1.) This Definition equally fences againſt Sabellianiſm and ſome of the Schoolmen, as it deſcribes a Perſon not to be a Quality, Accident, or Attribute, but a compleat, proper, living, *ſubſtantial* Perſon: I don't mean a *ſeparate Subſtance*, becauſe the ſame infinite Subſtance is common to the whole undivided Godhead, and tho' it ſubſiſts differently in each, a Perſon is not a meer Mode of Being, becauſe the particular Manner of Subſiſtence is in Conjunction with the Eſſence, and not abſtracted from it, but inſeparably, neceſſarily, and eternally remaining in it; which different Manner of ſubſiſting in the divine Nature imports ſuch diſtinct Relations, as can never co-incide *in* one and the ſame Perſon, tho' they *concur* in the Unity of the divine Nature.

(2.) This alſo guards againſt real Tritheiſm, *viz.* of three Perſons being three ſelf-conſcious Minds, or abſolute Beings, *each exiſting ſeparately by itſelf, as Angels or Men do:* For, according to the Deſcription I have given above of a divine Perſon, they all ſubſiſt in one and the

ſame

ſame Nature, in which they mutually exiſt together, as in their Subject, or *Subſtratum*, and cannot poſſibly exiſt by themſelves without it; for no Perſon can be abſtracted from the divine Nature, which is undivided in Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. All the Objections therefore againſt a Trinity of Perſons in the Godhead, which are drawn from a Suppoſition, that the very Notion of a Perſon imports a *ſeparately ſubſiſting Being*, are here of no force; for the Word *Perſon*, as apply'd *diſtinctly* to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, does not ſignify a *ſeparate Subſiſtence*, but only *compleat* Subſiſtence; and conſequently tho' the Perſons of Men are diſtinct Men, as well as diſtinct Perſons, this is no Ground to affirm, that the uncreated Perſons in the *one* divine Nature are diſtinct Gods; and yet this is the Sum of all the Arguments againſt three Perſons and one God, and *all the Contradiction* Men pretend to ſee in it. And indeed it may be ſafely acknowledged (as Cuſtom has fix'd the Idea of a *ſeparate* Subſiſtence upon the Term *Perſon*) 'tis in this Senſe very improper, and apt to lead us into pernicious Errors: But then again, conſidering our broken Knowledge, any other ſtronger and clearer Term that we may arrive at, to expreſs our Thoughts of this Myſtery, will give to others but confus'd Conceptions about Subjects, concerning which our own are ſo lame and imperfect; and yet probably this is the utmoſt Height we ſhall ever climb to in this Life, where we ſee but thro' a Glaſs darkly. And now if we wou'd but make *ſome Allowances* for the Narrowneſs of our Minds, and our Language, the Doctrine of the bleſſed Trinity would appear defenſible *as 'tis reveal'd*; and they who perſiſt in denying it, in order to diſprove it, muſt firſt comprehend the divine Nature, or elſe they can never ſhew, that *three divine* Perſons, according to the above Definition, may not be *one God*, tho' *three humane* Perſons cannot be *one Man*, much leſs with any *Shadow* of Ingenuity, Candour, and Juſtice, charge ſo ſublime a Doctrine with Contradiction.

For

For 'tis worſe than trifling to diſpute againſt three Perſons in the Godhead, from the *bare* Signification of the Word *Perſon*, when applied to humane Creatures; for all the World knows we don't uſe it in the ſame Senſe when applied to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, as when applied to Men; and can it be fair to impoſe a Meaning on a Word, which we unanimouſly reject?

Having thus endeavour'd to fix ſome certain Senſe on the Term *Perſon*, that it may be known what is intended when we ſay there are three Perſons in the Godhead, I ſhall next proceed as I propos'd.

(*2dly.*) To enquire whether this Meaning may be ſo conſiſtent with the Unity of the Godhead, as not neceſſarily to introduce three ſeparate Gods.

Here I don't preſume to tell *how* it is, (*for who can ſearch out God, who can find out the Almighty to Perfection?*) my Deſign being only to eſtabliſh the Truth of the Doctrine, and thereby ſkreen it from the Attacks of Sophiſtry, and the Miſtakes of Ignorance. To do this, it will be neceſſary to ſtate the *Order* of Perſons in the Trinity, and then ſhew, that the divine Nature *cannot be ſeparated* from *any one* of the divine Perſons, and conſequently, that they are united in one common, divine, *infinite* Nature.

(*1ſt.*) I am to ſtate *the Order* of Perſons in the Trinity, which I would do with all Submiſſion and Tenderneſs.

Whether all three Perſons of the bleſſed Trinity are *eſſentially* equal in Power, Glory, and Duration, is not now the Queſtion. This we may aſſent to, and yet conſidering the Father as the firſt in Order, we are led to conſider him as having Subſiſtence from none but himſelf; to conſider the Son alſo as receiving his Subſiſtence from the Father, in ſome ſuch manner as is expreſs'd in Scripture, by his being ſtyl'd the *only begotten*; which is vaſtly different from humane Generation, and to us altogether incomprehenſible; and finally,

nally, to consider the Holy Ghost, as *coming* (or *proceeding*) from the Father and the Son. We have very little more than this reveal'd to us concerning the *Order* of three Persons subsisting in the one Godhead, which renders it a very abstruse Point, and soon runs the Inquisitive into a Cloud. Now as he that would discourse to a Man born blind concerning Light and Colours, must use perhaps very improper Expressions to make himself, tho' never so little, understood; so it is in the Case before us. As we have no Ideas proportionate to the Subject, we can form no other Word more proper to express the Son's being begotten, but the Term *Generation*, and the Spirit's coming from the Father and the Son, but by the Term *Procession*; and the Father's primary Subsistence, but the Term *Unorigination*. The Meaning of these Terms we know; but *how* the Son is begotten, or the Spirit proceeds, or the Father is the Fountain, or first Principle of Subsistence, when they are all three *equally eternal*, we can't distinctly account for: And yet this Manner or Order of subsisting seems sufficient to ground such an Emphasis upon, as we may venture to say, *consistent* with Trinitarian Principles, that the Son, in *this respect*, is *subordinate* to the Father, tho' *not inferior*. Hence some, unawares, have been drawn in to believe, that the Father alone is God of himself, because the Son and Holy Ghost receiv'd their Subsistence from him. But this wrong Conclusion is entirely owing to their not distinguishing between the Essence of God, and the divine Person's peculiar way of subsisting; for the divine Nature was from all Eternity undivided in all; so that every one of the three Persons is essentially eternally God; the first Person subsists in it after a Manner proper to the Father, and the Son and Holy Ghost inseparably with him, but in an ineffable way peculiar to themselves. This, 'tis evident, makes a true Distinction between the Father and them; for the formal

Rela-

Relations, or Properties, by which the Persons are distinguish'd, cannot be essential in this respect, because they are peculiar to the Persons only, and not common, as the Essence is. The divine Nature then of the Father (abstractly consider'd) is not his *Fatherhood*, nor the divine Nature of the Son his *Filiation*, nor that of the Holy Ghost his *Procession*; but the first Person's Order and Manner of subsisting in the divine Nature constitutes him, as he thus begat his Son, a Father; and the same may be said of the Son and Holy Ghost, as begotten and proceeding; so that as they also subsist *inseparably and eternally* in the same Godhead, they are very justly said to be the one living and true God: For if the living Essence of the Father be the divine Godhead, or Supreme Being, so is the Essence of the Son, because it is the same. For 'tis most certain, that a Nature of infinite and boundless Perfection cannot belong to any Being that is *not infinite*, i. e. to any thing that is not itself; it can't be extended beyond, or out of itself, because 'tis boundless. And as there is nothing infinite but itself, and there can be but one infinite, therefore the Son and Holy Ghost, to whom this infinite Nature belongs (there being no Mode, Quality, or any thing else *superadded* by the Father to cause their Subsistence, that could be *extraessential*, or really separable from his own eternal Nature) is one and the same *infinite God* with the Father, possessing the same indivisible Essence, the same divine Perfections, and so all three Persons mutually subsist in *one* omnipresent, spiritual, independent Godhead, or Substance. Which leads me to shew,

(2*dly*.) That the divine Nature cannot be separated from any *one* of the divine Persons, and consequently they are united in one common, infinite Essence; so that the Meaning of the Term *Person* is not inconsistent with the Unity of God.

The Father *neceſſarily* begat the Son from Eternity, and ſo he is not barely the Offspring of his Will, but God by Nature, as has been briefly hinted, and will be more largely handled in the Sequel, and conſequently he is *Ens ſummè neceſſarium*, as well as the Father, God of himſelf, and not God by Participation; for the divine Nature, which is from Eternity, is the Nature of the Son conſidered *eſſentially*, as well as the Father: 'Tis not *begotten*, *caus'd*, or *produc'd*, any more than the *Eſſence* of the Father, but is of itſelf; ſo that with the utmoſt Propriety we may ſay, that the Son is *God of himſelf*, though he be not a *Son of himſelf*, but of the Father; the *Subſiſtence* of the Son being begotten, but the *divine Nature* of the Son is unbegotten.

Our Lord then is the only begotten Son of God, ſubſiſting in the *unbegotten*, *uncreated* Nature of God, and ſo is not a different God from the Father, but of the ſame divine Eſſence, and therefore an eternal, independent Being, who did not begin to be God, who cannot ceaſe to be. And the ſame may be ſaid of the Holy Ghoſt; for ſince the divine Eſſence is uncompounded and undivided, it muſt neceſſarily follow, that whoever ſubſiſts in it muſt be God; and conſequently, I humbly conceive, the Definition I have given of a Perſon is not inconſiſtent with the Unity of God; which ſhews, there is a Medium between the Mode of Subſiſtence and a *ſeparate* Spirit; between *Sabellianiſm* and Tritheiſm, contrary to the Inſinuation of the Author of *Unity*: And that the Doctrine of the Son's eternal Generation does not lead us to admit three Gods, as Mr. *Forſter* has ſuggeſted, becauſe the three Perſons are not to be conſidered as abſtracted from, but as truly ſubſiſting in the divine Nature, there being nothing to diſtinguiſh between one Perſon and another, but their *peculiar Mode* of Exiſtence in that Nature. And herein lies the Glory of the myſterious Three, that dazzles the Eyes of Reaſon: (a Difficulty which we own and confeſs ourſelves at a loſs to explain)

plain) And no wonder if the Reader obſerve a Penury of Words and Thoughts in any one that attempts to treat of it; for it tranſcends all poſſible Conception, ſoon tires the richeſt Language, and blunts the moſt labour'd Turn of Expreſſion. Therefore I have purpoſely wav'd, as much as poſſible, fording into theſe Depths; as believing that if the whole Church of God, militant and triumphant, the innumerable Throng of Cherubims and Seraphims, and thoſe vaſt intellectual Beings in Glory, ſhould combine in a full Aſſembly to ſit upon the Enquiry, and communicate all their noble Ideas to one another about *the Manner how* theſe three Perſons ſubſiſt in *one God-head*, though I doubt not but they glory and triumph in the *Truth* and *Conſequences* of the Myſtery, yet they would readily acknowledge the *Manner* of it utterly inconceivable and inexplicable. This brings me to enquire,

(*3dly.*) Whether in any Senſe each of the three Perſons may be called a Spirit.

The Author of *Unity* attempts to ſhew, *That Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are three diſtinct Perſons, as truly as three Angels, or three humane Souls are.** But if each of the divine Perſons hath a diſtinct, *entire and ſeparate* Mind of its own belonging to it, and that as really diſtinct and divided from the Mind of the other two, as one Being or Mind can be ſeparated from another; and if the Son be of the ſame Nature with the Father, as has been in part already demonſtrated, this muſt neceſſarily infer a *ſpecifick Nature*, and ſo imply *three Gods*, as much as three humane Perſons are three Men, contrary to what has been already refuted: Or if it be alledg'd, that the Father is the *Supreme God*, and as he is a *diſtinct* Spirit from the Son and Holy Ghoſt, ſo he has a quite *different* and *ſuperior* Nature; this muſt be ſhocking to every ſerious Chriſtian to ſee into whoſe Name

* Page 7.

he is ſolemnly baptized, *viz.* into the Name of God and two Creatures; for if the Son and Holy Ghoſt are not by Nature God, and in that reſpect one with the Father, they muſt be infinitely beneath him, and conſequently no God, as will appear. And if the Author will call an *inferior, ſeparate Being* from the Father, *God*, he can mean no more than a nominal God, which is but amuſing his Readers; and too little an Artifice to recommend the gilded Scheme. But let us examin what he has to ſupport this, *That Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are three diſtinct (ſeparate) Spirits.*

The firſt Text he has choſen for this purpoſe, is, *God is a Spirit*; † which is not ſpoken of the Father *excluſive* of the Son and Holy Spirit, as will be ſhewn in a more proper Place.

The ſecond, as ill choſen, to prove our bleſſed Lord a *ſeparate* Spirit from the Father, is, *How much more ſhall the Blood of Chriſt, who, through the eternal Spirit, offer'd himſelf without Spot to God, purge the Conſcience?* &c. * If by the *eternal Spirit* is meant *Chriſt* himſelf, as the Author thinks, this muſt be a clear Conceſſion to us, that our Redeemer is an *eternal* Spirit; (the Dignity of whoſe Godhead gave Virtue and Value to his Sacrifice, as this Text ſhews) and ſo it can't imply that he had a *ſeparate* Spirit from the Father (unleſs there be two eternal Spirits) any more than when he is called God, imports *that* he is another ſeparate God in the ſame, *exact*, and higheſt Senſe of the Word, as the Father is God, *viz.* neceſſarily and eternally; which I dare ſay the Author won't vouch.

The other Inſtance produc'd to ſhew Chriſt is a ſeparate Spirit, is, *Rom.* i. 4. where the Apoſtle ſays, *That Jeſus Chriſt was declared to be the Son of God, with Power, according to the Spirit of Holineſs.* The Author conceals

† Joh. iv. 24. * Heb. ix. 14.

ceals the next Words in the ſame Verſe, by *the Reſurrection from the Dead*, leaſt the Reader ſhould ſee a Proof of his Godhead ſhine out from that divine Energy which he exerted in raiſing himſelf from the Dead, by which he was declar'd to be the Son of God, and God, by a moſt eminent and convincing Inſtance of Almighty Power; which is alſo attributed to the Father, to ſhew they are one in Eſſence and Energy, and their Works undivided. This Phraſe then, *according to the Spirit of Holineſs*, demonſtrates his divine Nature, or that he is the Son of God; as the Phraſe, *according to the Fleſh*, in the former Verſe, ſhews his humane Nature, or that he was the Son of Man; the *Antitheſis* being plain and undeniable. So that upon the Whole, though the Father be allow'd to be call'd a Spirit, the Son a Spirit, and the Holy Ghoſt a Spirit, as is not *diſputed*, this does not prove them three ſeparate Spirits.

In the next Page, he aims to ſhew, That *the Son of God is a diſtinct Spirit from the Father, and was ſo before his Incarnation*,† by conſidering *they have two diſtinct Underſtandings and Wills*. The firſt Inſtance he gives is their *having two diſtinct Wills*, from *Joh.* vi. 38. *I came down from Heaven not to do mine own Will, but the Will of him that ſent me.* The Author here notes, *That our Lord ſpeaks of his Will, as to his higheſt or divine Nature*; the Reaſon he offers is, *the humane Nature did not come down from Heaven*; but if he will only conſult *Joh.* iii. 13. he will eaſily perceive 'tis there expreſly aſſerted, *that the Son of Man* was in Heaven whilſt Chriſt was *actually* on Earth; which ſhews, that what is properly ſpoken of the Perſon of Chriſt, is not always true of *both Natures*, which entirely overthrows this Argument he has offer'd to ſhew the Words were ſpoken of Chriſt in his higheſt Character, *becauſe the humane Nature could not come down*

† Pag. 8.

from Heaven. For 'tis equally inconsistent to suppose the humane Nature to be *in* Heaven whilst Christ was *on* Earth, as to suppose it to come down *from* Heaven when 'twas *never yet* there: The Truth is, the humane Nature being taken into Union with the divine, not by Confusion of Substance, but only by being united in one Person, tho' these two Natures remain as *distinct* as before the Union, yet all the *Properties of a Person* belong to *both Natures* united; and hence, whatever was done or suffered by Christ, was attributed to *his Person* consisting of both Natures;* so that he is sometimes denominated by one Nature, and sometimes by another; and there are Actions attributed to him in his highest Character, that are proper only to his lowest; and so *vice versâ*, which notwithstanding are properly predicated of his Person, who sustains both Natures, which is the Case before us; so that the *Will* here mention'd, for any thing the Author has advanced against it, may be as well understood of his *humane Soul* as divine Mind: "For tho' there is a Communication of Names and "Idioms (as Dr. *Fiddes* well observes) in consequence "of the personal Union between the two Natures of "Christ, so that the very same Person that is call'd "the Son of God, and the Son of Man, is said to "have been born, and to be from everlasting, to die, "and to have Life in himself; yet this manner of "speaking, which wholly arises from the Unity of "Christ's Person, does no more suppose any Change of "the two Natures, so as to render the Properties of "them convertible, than it supposes, that because the "same Man is tall or healthy, with respect to the "State of his Body, or wise and learned, with respect "to the Qualities of his Mind, that therefore his "Soul and Body have no separate or distinct Proper-

"ties,

* See an Instance where Christ is said to be the living Bread that cometh down from Heaven, and yet this Bread he tells us is his Flesh, *v.* 51.

" ties, but only such as may be reciprocally or indiffe-
" rently attributed to them both." *

But after all, if we *do* suppose the Words to have reference to our Lord in his *highest* Capacity, they are far from proving that he hath a *separate Will* from his Father, and may be interpreted, *q. d.* I came down from Heaven not to do any *private Will* of my own, *contrary* to my Father's; being his only begotten Son, of the same Nature, Power, and Operation, I must *necessarily* do the Will of him that sent me. Hence we often read, that what our Lord did, or spoke, was exactly conformable to his Father's Will; for being one in Essence with him, he can have no separate Will of his own; and as he had the *same Designs* in view in coming into the World, as the Father had in sending him, to give himself a Ransom for Sinners, he had no separate Interest to carry on.

The next Argument that is produced to shew *the Father and Son two separate Spirits*, is because they have *two distinct Understandings*: For the Proof of which the Author very faintly alledges *Matth.* xxiv. 36, where Christ is said not to *know* the Day of Judgment. In the Top of the Page he had propos'd to shew this to be true, even *before* Christ's Incarnation; but tho' the former Text might seem to look this way, the latter he has offer'd, to shew *two distinct Understandings* from Christ not knowing the Day of Judgment, every one may see can be only understood of him as *actually* incarnate; and besides, as shall be hereafter prov'd, the Words are spoken of him as *Son of Man* in his lowest Character; and so can't be in any respect pertinent to his Purpose, whence all his Inferences in the next Page, to shew where *there are distinct Wills and Understandings, are distinct Spirits*, are of no Force at all.

Having

* Theol. Specul. Vol. 1. p. 463.

Having thus far, as briefly as poſſible, examin'd the Author's Plea for the three Perſons being three ſeparate Spirits, I ſhall now endeavour to offer an Expedient to unfetter his Thoughts, that he may not always ſuppoſe, where there is mention made of any one or more of the Perſons of the Trinity, that it muſt imply they are ſeparate and divided Spirits; and if I can ſhew that in any reſpect the Father may be call'd a Spirit, the Son a Spirit, and the Holy Ghoſt a Spirit, without making three *ſeparate diſtinct Beings*, this will obviate thoſe ſeeming Difficulties, which the Author imagines his calling the *three Perſons three Spirits* will throw upon the Trinitarian Scheme. Now 'tis manifeſt that the Term *God* may be given to each divine Perſon *ſingly*, becauſe each has the divine Nature and Perfections, and to all *three conjointly*, without involving any Manner of Contradiction; now 'tis only to allow, by way of Analogy, the like Difference of Signification in the Term Spirit, when differently applied, and 'twill eaſily ſolve the Author's Objection; and really there is the ſame Reaſon for it, as I ſhall attempt to ſhew, by explaining the former Part of the Definition of a Perſon, which, in order to remove this Difficulty, I have reſerv'd to this Place, and which I ſhall therefore be forc'd to repeat, *viz.*

A ſpiritual infinite intelligent Agent, which muſt not be conſider'd as abſtracted from, but as truly ſubſiſting in the divine Nature, and as mutually, eternally, and inſeparably related to the other co-eſſential Perſons in the Godhead, from whom he is *ſufficiently* and only diſtinguiſh'd by ſome perſonal, and as ſuch, incommunicable Properties.

When I ſay that a Perſon is a ſpiritual infinite intelligent Agent, or Subſiſtent, it can by no means be infer'd that there are three ſeparate Spirits in the Godhead; for theſe Attributes of ſpiritual, infinite, and intelligent, ariſe not from the *perſonal* Diſtinction, but only from the

divine

divine Nature, which belonging *equally* to all the divine Perſons, all the eſſential Attributes of it muſt equally belong to each; from whence it follows, that *ſpiritual*, *infinite*, &c. being Attributes, not reſulting from the *Manner* of Subſiſtence or perſonal Diſtinction, but from *the Eſſence*, which is common to all three Perſons, it may very juſtly be predicated of *each Perſon*, without any Shadow of Contradiction; for every one knows a Contradiction is to deny and affirm the ſame Thing in the very ſame Senſe or Reſpect; and that 'tis no Contradiction to call the Father a Spirit, the Son a Spirit, and the Holy Ghoſt a Spirit, and yet not ſuppoſe them three ſeparate Spirits, will perhaps appear in a better Light, by conſidering particularly each of thoſe Attributes.

Firſt, Tho' the Definition intend a *ſpiritual* Agent diſtinctly ſubſiſting, yet it don't follow that there are three ſeparate Spirits in the Godhead; for one and the ſame *undivided ſpiritual Subſtance* may ſuſtain three diſtinct Perſons, without any *Multiplication* of the one *ſpiritual* Nature; for this being infinite, and conſider'd in all and each of them, they cannot be ſeparate Spirits, as three humane Souls are; ſo that each of the divine Perſons being of the ſame *ſpiritual* Subſtance, may be properly call'd a *Spirit*, without ſuppoſing three ſeparate Spirits; becauſe this Attribute of Spiritual, which is predicated of each Perſon, ſprings from the divine Eſſence, which is common to all three. Again,

Secondly, Tho' the Definition implies that each of the three Perſons may be call'd *infinite*, it can't be underſtood of three ſeparate, infinite, alien Beings, and that each hath infinite Perfections proper to himſelf alone, but of one and the *ſame* infinite Eſſence that is common to all three, that hath infinite Perfections, which alſo belong to *each* of the divine Perſons, even as the *divine Nature itſelf* does, which certainly may be conſider'd under the Notion of three relative Subſiſtents, mutually *referring*

ring to each other, without deſtroying the *Unity* of God, ſeeing the Father himſelf is, and *ſubſiſts* as a Father by having a Son; and therefore when the ſame Scriptures, which aſſure us of the Unity of the divine Eſſence, do likewiſe join the Son in the ſame *Titles*, *Attributes*, *Operations*, and *Worſhip*, it ſhews there are more Perſons in the Godhead than one, each of which is infinite, by one common infinite Subſtance or Eſſence. Again,

Thirdly, Tho' in the Definition of a Perſon is included an *intelligent* Agent or *Subſiſtent*, it does not infer a ſeparate *Intellect* in each Perſon; for each divine uncreated Perſon has no other Principle of Knowledge, than the *one infinite omniſcient Mind*, or divine Nature; which, abſolutely conſider'd, is the ſame in all three Perſons; and therefore they have one and the *ſame* Knowledge: Hence, whatever each of the divine Perſons knows, he knows it by an infinite Act of Knowledge, *comprehending* both himſelf and the other two Perſons, as well as all that is knowable beſides: So that the perfect Unity of their Nature makes them *mutually* conſcious and knowing, not by any *ſeparate Intellect*, but by the one common omniſcient Mind, as is not obſcurely intimated to us, *Matth.* xi. 27. compared with 1 *Cor.* ii. 10, 11. *And no Man knoweth the Son but the Father, neither knoweth any Man the Father but the Son. The Spirit ſearcheth all things, yea the deep things of God; for what Man knoweth the things of a Man, ſave the Spirit of Man which is in him? ſo the things of God knoweth no Man but the Spirit of God:* Hence tho' there be three *intelligent* Perſons in the Godhead, there are not three ſeparate *Underſtandings*; the Father is omniſcient, the Son omniſcient, and the Spirit omniſcient, which does not imply three diſtinct ſeparate omniſcient Beings, as different from one another *as three humane Souls* can be, but only *variouſly* diſtinguiſh one and the ſame Knowledge, as it *proceeds* from each: In like manner God's comprehenſive View of all things is ſtyl'd *Omniſcience*, and his Knowledge of Futurity *Præſcience*;

Præſcience; and yet none dare ſay there is ſuch a Difference between Præſcience and Omniſcience as will *not conſiſt* with one infinite Underſtanding. I own the Inſtance is not exactly parallel, but it may a little conduce to ſhew, that tho' one Perſon neither is nor can be the other, and each of them *diſtinctly* underſtand, yet they underſtand by *one* and the *ſame Intellect*; *ſo* that 'tis one thing for each Perſon to *have* an infinite ſeparate *Underſtanding* belonging to *himſelf* alone, and another to have an infinite Mind belonging to *each* of them, which is the ſame undivided Eſſence in all: And this holds equally true of Omnipotence, and all the other *eſſential* Attributes, for each Perſon ſubſiſting in one and the ſame infinite Nature has the ſame Perfections and Attributes, as well as Nature, belonging to him; which, if carefully attended to, would *untye* moſt of thoſe knotty Objections which ſome have aim'd to twiſt, in order to perplex the Trinitarian Scheme.

The Author himſelf is a little appriz'd of ſomething that may be urg'd in our Favour: *All that I conceive they will ſay, is that three divine Perſons are not ſeparate Beings, or Spirits, like three created Perſons; but this is the very thing in queſtion, and ſo will not be granted to them without Proof.** This being evidently prov'd from what I have already advanced, and will be further illuſtrated and confirm'd in the following Treatiſe, I need not here enquire why Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are not three diſtinct Beings, as well as three created Perſons are; but ſhall rather examine what the Author has offer'd to prove they are ſo. His firſt Argument is this,

That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are three Perſons is evident, in that the Son took upon him the humane Nature, and ſuffer'd in it, whereas the Father and the Holy Ghoſt did not: Now

* Unity, p. 10.

Now if the Son ſuffer'd and the Father did not, ſurely they muſt be more than two diſtinct Somewhats in one and the ſame Spirit. *

In Anſwer to this,

That there are more Perſons *in the Godhead* than *one* we own, and think it evident, from the *Son's taking upon him* the humane Nature, which I alſo conceive is a Proof of his Godhead; for 'tis ſaid *he did not take the Nature of Angels, but the Seed of* Abraham. Now as there is no other Underſtanding, or rational Nature, that the Scriptures diſcover, but the *Divine*, *Angelical*, and *Humane*, 'tis apparent that the Son was *poſſeſs'd* of the divine Nature before he aſſum'd the humane *(for he did not take the Nature of Angels)* and in that reſpect was one in Eſſence with his Father, as the very Notion of a *proper Son* implies; ſo that this Perſon, the Son of God, was more than a *bare Somewhat* in one and the ſame *ſpiritual* Subſtance, being *a compleat Subſiſtent* in that Nature, tho' not *a ſeparate* one. But here lies the Abſurdity, according to the Author: *If they are both one Spirit, it would be a Contradiction to ſay the one ſuffer'd when the other did not.* To which it may be reply'd, in the Incarnation of the Son of God, the whole divine Nature, *as he poſſeſs'd it*, became incarnate, and not intirely in reſpect of all its Ways of ſubſiſting, but in that Manner which was *proper* to the ſecond Perſon of the Trinity only; and therefore ſince the Godhead is not *incarnate* under the proper Mode of ſubſiſting which the Father has in it, *nor* that other which the Holy Ghoſt has in it, the Incarnation of the whole divine Nature, *as the Son ſubſiſts in it*, does not infer the Incarnation of the whole Trinity; and conſequently, as *one Perſon* is not *another*, he may become Man, and ſo

* Unity, p. 10.

ſo ſuffer and die, without any *Appearance* of a Contradiction; for the divine Nature is *boundleſs* and *omnipreſent*; and why may it not, as the Son ſubſiſts in it, be *united* to the humane Nature, and yet the Father and the Holy Ghoſt be *exempted* from the Union, as well as God be *in Heaven* and *Earth*, by his Preſence, at the ſame time? We are told, *no Man hath aſcended up to Heaven, but he that came down from Heaven, even the Son of Man which is in Heaven.** Which demonſtrates, that when our Lord viſibly converſed here, he was according to ſomewhat inviſible, *i. e.* his *divine Nature* then *actually* in Heaven, and according to this Nature he was *ever* in Heaven, tho' by the Union of it to our *viſible* Nature here, he might be ſaid to come down, becauſe hereby he took up a more *peculiar Reſidence* in the Fleſh than he had before done: No more Inconſiſtency, I conceive, can be prov'd in this Account of the Son's Incarnation, than in ſuppoſing God, who is infinite and immenſe, to be in *two* or *more* Places at a time. If any are diſſatisfied with theſe Hints, and aſk how this can be, let them tell us *how Aaron*'s Rod, being a *dry Stick*, could *bloſſom* and bear ripe Almonds:† If they ſtill demurr, let them conſult 1 *Tim.* iii. 16. where the Truth of this Myſtery is ſo eſtabliſh'd by the divine Teſtimony, as to be put *beyond* all diſpute: *Without Controverſy great is the Myſtery of Godlineſs: God was manifeſt in the Fleſh.* Adorable Goodneſs! God the Son ſo far humbled himſelf, as to deſcend from that infinite *Height* of Glory, which was *co-eſſential* to him with the Father and the Holy Ghoſt, and *tabernacled* with us here below; but in this low Stoop, tho' his original Glory and Excellencies were veil'd and ſhadow'd, they were not loſt or diminiſh'd, but remain'd as they were from *all Eternity* without the *leaſt* Alteration, notwithſtanding his

* John iii. 13. † Num. xvii. 8.

his *perſonal Preſence* and *Union* with our Nature; the Word was made Fleſh and dwelt among us, and yet was ſtill *in the Boſom of the Father*, *John* i. 14. compar'd with the 18th Verſe; and how this can agree with the *Arian Logos*, a Creature to be omnipreſent, to be in Heaven and Earth at the ſame time, is prodigiouſly unaccountable.

But leaſt any one ſhould think it too *mean* and low a piece of Condeſcenſion, in the Son of God's becoming Man, and ſuffering for our Sins, 'twill not be amiſs further to obſerve, that tho' he was in a peculiar and *intimate Manner* united to our Nature, he was not *tranſform'd* into it; and conſequently could not become *finite and paſſible* like Mortals, or undergo any *Change* derogatory from his *ſupreme* Dignity. For as God appear'd of old to the Prophets, and by an immediate viſible Glory in the Ark and Temple was in a peculiar Manner preſent with the Children of *Iſrael*, which, upon the ſtricteſt *Principles* of Philoſophy, may be granted to be true, without ſuppoſing the divine Being ever the *leſs* preſent, or leſs happy and glorious in Heaven: So his Son may become incarnate, yea, and the humane Nature, to which he is vitally and ſtrictly united, may be *incident* to all the *Afflictions* of this Life, without any leſſening of his divine Majeſty (eſpecially when this was the very End and Deſign of our Lord's Incarnation, *to ſhed his Blood for the Remiſſion of Sins*) and all his Sufferings *terminated* in his humane Nature only, whilſt his Godhead, *incapable* of Frailties and Imperfection, remain'd in full Bliſs and unconfin'd, filling Heaven and Earth with his Preſence.

What the Author again obſerves from Dr. *Waterland*, *where there is no Idea there can be no Aſſent*, looks very odd, for doubtleſs we may believe this Propoſition upon the Teſtimony of God, *the Word was made Fleſh*, the Terms of which we underſtand, and ſo may ſafely aſſent: But there is no occaſion to have a clear

Notion

Notion *how* this can be before we believe it; and ſhould the Author wait to know the *exact Manner* how God was manifeſt in the Fleſh, I may venture to ſay he will continue an Unbeliever to the *End* of Time: Is it not ſurprizing, that Men who lay in for ſuch a *Claim* to Reaſon, as they'll ſcarce allow any one elſe to *ſhare* in it but themſelves, ſhould talk ſo irrationally? He might as well deny that there is any ſuch Propoſition in the Bible, as, *God was manifeſt in the Fleſh*, tho' he had read it a hundred times over, becauſe he can't apprehend how it ſhould be, and by all his Struggles of Thought can't form one adæquate Idea about it, as reject the Truth of it *ſupported by divine Teſtimony*, becauſe he is ignorant of the *Manner* of it. But let this ſuffice. The two other Inſtances he has produc'd to prove Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, to be three diſtinct Perſons may be allow'd as juſt; but his Inferences thence, that they are *three diſtinct or ſeparate Spirits*, I deny, having already ſhewn that the Father may be call'd a Spirit, the Son a Spirit, and the Holy Ghoſt a Spirit, without *implying* three *divine* Beings, or *ſeparate* Spirits: And I hope, if the impartial Enquirer will honeſtly weigh what has been ſaid, he will have no occaſion to fear being cenſur'd *as an Heretick* (as the Author intimates) which dreadful Name he would ſhroud his yielding Reader from, by the venerable Authorities of Dr. *Sherlock*, *Mr. How*, *and Athanaſius*, *and other orthodox Fathers*, *who* (ſays he) *have maintain'd the ſame in their Writings*. But when the Author can ſhew me from *either* of them, that they make three Perſons, three *ſeparate divided Spirits*, *or Beings*, *as three Angels are*, *or three humane Souls*, as he has done, (which if they do not, 'tis nothing to his purpoſe) I'll ſay he has *read* them, *fairly* repreſented their Meaning, as well as done *Juſtice* to the World.

That the Reader may have a Specimen of their Notion, I ſhall give him a diſtinct and brief View of it

in their own Words. As for Dr. *Sherlock*, thus he delivers himself from the Author's Misrepresentation.

" We constantly affirm, that Father, Son, and Holy " Ghost, by an intimate and *inseparable* Union to each " other, are but *one* true God; but as their Persons can " never be separated, so they must never be consider'd " in a separate State; and if we will imagine such an " *impossible Absurdity* as this, neither of them are the " one true God, for whoever separates them *destroys the* " *Deity*, and leaves neither Father, Son, nor Holy " Ghost.*

As for Mr. *How*, † he says, " That the Godhead is not " supposed more necessarily to exist, than these three " are to *co-exist* in the nearest and most intimate Union " with each other therein.

As for *Athanasius*, the Creed (if his) that bears his Name, will witness that he held not three *distinct separate Spirits*: " For there is one Person of the Father, " another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost; " but the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of " the Holy Ghost, is all one, the Glory equal, the Ma- " jesty co-eternal. *And when he says in the next Words*, " such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the " Holy Ghost;" the Meaning of *them* is, that all the Perfections and Attributes of the Godhead may be affirm'd of *each* of the Persons, which are Attributes not of the Persons as such, but of the Essence which is but one (as I explain'd it before) so that each of the Persons in the divine Nature are Eternal, Almighty, *&c.* in one and the same eternal almighty Essence; which I am sure is far from making the three Persons three separate Spirits; 'tis what *Athanasius* strenuously contends against in all his Writings.††

CHAP.

---

* Notes on *Athanasius*'s Creed, p. 87. † Calm Discourse, p. 43.
†† *Athanas. de unitâ deitate Trinitatis ad Theop. Lib.* 1.

CHAP. III.

An Enquiry, whether the Term God, *according to its proper Import, is taken* absolutely *in the Scriptures to denote the* one Supreme Being; *or whether 'tis only a* relative *Word, signifying a Person having* Dominion *or Office.*

WHEN Men have precipitantly run into Notions contrary to Scripture and Reason, and perhaps with some *Warmth* endeavour'd to propagate and defend them, 'tis surprizing to see, when pinch'd by superiour Argument, how they wriggle and twist to guard their dear Reputations; and, like those who are just drowning, greedily catch at the least Twig, to *save* them from a final Plunge: A sad, but *too common Incident* in most of our religious Disputes, and which to me seems to be the real *Case* of our Author's subtle and ingenious Leaders, whose Steps he has aim'd to follow; for when they disputed against the Divinity of our Lord, 'twas urg'd against them, that he was *expresly styl'd God*, without any Limitation or Restriction, and so must be *true* and *proper* God; and seeing there are no more Gods but *one*, he must be *one* in Nature and Essence with his Father; agreeable to what he himself says, *I and my Father are one.* This could not be denied without a *direct* Violation of the inspired Writings; and therefore to elude the *Force* of the Argument, they fled to this *thin* Refuge, of making the Word *God* a *relative Term*, denoting only one having Power, Dominion, and Authority, *&c.* A fine *spun* Criticism, it must be own'd, and extremely well *calculated* to amuse the Thoughtless and Unwary: So that 'tis no wonder to hear some of these Gentlemen

complementing our bleſſed Lord with the *Title* of having real and proper Divinity, as well as the Father; for thus they may flouriſh with Words, and yet in their *very* Hearts believe him to be a *mere Creature* at the ſame time; for, according to this Notion, *whoever has Dominion* is in a proper Senſe God. 'Tis really worth the good Reader's while to take ſome Notice of this, which is the great Foundation of the Author's Diſtinction of a *ſupreme* and *ſubordinate God*, in the 11th, 12th and 13th Pages, *viz.* that becauſe God, the eternal, ſupreme Being, ſtands in ſome relation to his Creatures, ſuch as Creator, Governor, and the like, that therefore the Term *God*, which is *expreſſive* of his infinite Nature and Perfections, is merely a relative Word, and may be properly apply'd to any other Being that is not ſupreme. To lay open the Abſurdity and Weakneſs of this Fallacy, I ſhall briefly conſider,

(1.) In what Senſe the Term *God* is uſed.

(2.) That, according to its ſtrict and proper Meaning, it always, in *Scripture*, denotes the Supreme Being.

(3.) Conſider what may be offer'd to obviate the Author's Plea from the relative Terms, *my*, *thy*, *ours*, *his*, &c.

By ſhewing in what Senſe the Term *God* is us'd in Scripture, I hope to make it appear that 'tis taken in *two different* Senſes, ſometimes *figuratively*, and more frequently *properly*, but never *ſtrictly*, in a higher or lower Senſe for a *ſupreme* and *ſubordinate* God, which to aſſert, is both unſcriptural and inaccurate.

(1*ſt*.) 'Tis ſometimes uſed in a *figurative* Senſe, upon the Account of ſome faint Reſemblances that inferior Beings may have to the one ſupreme Being: As,

1. The Angels are ſtyl'd Gods by way of Alluſion, either for the Dignity of their Nature, or their Might and Wiſdom, wherein they excell all other Creatures;

Creatures; as in *Pſalm* viii. 5. thou haſt made him a little lower, מאלהים, than the Gods, or *than the Angels*, as 'tis explain'd, *Heb.* ii. 7.

2. In the ſame looſe, metaphorical Senſe 'tis apply'd to Kings and Judges, &c. becauſe they *reſemble* God in Point of *Dominion* and Power, *Pſal.* cxxxviii. 1. *I will praiſe thee with my whole Heart, before the Gods will I ſing praiſe unto thee*; before the Judges, דונא, as the *Chaldee* renders it, *q. d.* I will confeſs thee *publickly*, O Lord, nor will I diſſemble thy Praiſe, and the *Glory* of thy Name, even before Princes and Judges of the Earth.

3. In the ſame improper Senſe 'tis given to others that are *inveſted* with ſome dignified Office, or Power, to act for the Cauſe and Honour of God. Thus the Lord commiſſions *Moſes*; *Behold, I have made thee a God to* Pharaoh; * not *abſolutely*, but in a limited and *reſtrained* Senſe, *to Pharaoh*; *and* Aaron *thy Brother ſhall be thy Prophet.*

4. The Word *God*, by a Metonymy, is applied to Idols or falſe Gods; becauſe, according to the *depraved Opinion*, and Eſtimation of Idolaters, they were accounted *real*, and religious Worſhip paid them, contrary to *Reaſon* and the *divine* Precept; † wherefore the Lord commanded ſaying, *He that ſacrificeth unto any God, ſave unto the Lord only, he ſhall be utterly deſtroyed.* ‡

5. The Term *God* is applied in this figurative Senſe to the *Devil*, in *whom the God of this World hath blinded the Minds of them which believe not, leaſt the Light of the glorious Goſpel of Chriſt, who is the Image of God, ſhould ſhine into them.* †* No one can well think that the Devil is here ſimply and abſolutely called God, but only that he is as it were a God unto them *over whom* he has Dominion, and who prefer his Service to the Ho-

* Exod. vii. 1. † Exod. xx. 3, 5. ‡ Exod. xxii. 20.
†* 2 Cor. iv. 4.

nour of the great *Jehovah*. So Mammon is a God to the *Covetous*, the Belly a God to the *Glutton* and *Drunkard*, becauſe they are more ſwayed by the *Dictates* of Intereſt, Senſe, and Appetite, than by the *Commands* of Heaven, and place a greater Happineſs in them than in the chiefeſt Good.

Now if the Term *God* be *only* relative, and implies nothing but a Perſon having Dominion and Authority, *&c.* an Angel, a Magiſtrate, an Apoſtle, an Idol, yea the Devil, the great Abaddon, may be, properly and ſtrictly ſpeaking, *as much a God*, as God the Father; and what conſiderate Chriſtian can eaſily give into ſo *ſtrain'd* and *abſurd* a Conſtruction? For tho' all theſe may be in a figurative way ſtyl'd Gods, to apply exactly *the ſame Idea* to the Term *God*, when us'd to deſcribe the *ſupreme* Being, is a ſurprizing Stretch of Thought to ſerve an Hypotheſis, and can anſwer no End, ſeeing the Lord God Almighty has forbidden it, and aſſur'd us, that none is *properly* God but himſelf alone. The Lord is the *true* God —— *The Gods that have not made the Heavens and the Earth, even they ſhall periſh from the Earth, and from under theſe Heavens.* * Now nothing is more clearly reveal'd in Scripture than that our bleſſed Lord made the Heavens and the Earth, *things viſible and inviſible*, &c. ſo he comes plainly under the Deſcription of the *true* God in the Text, God in the higheſt, only, proper, and original Senſe of the Word. From what has been already ſuggeſted it plainly appears,

1. That the Term *God* being only attributed to others improperly and figurately, *merely* upon the Account of ſome Reſemblances they bear to the Supreme Being, either in Excellency or Dominion, *&c.* it muſt follow, that this Name *God* is proper to the Supreme Being alone, and in a peculiar and *different Senſe from all others* appropriated to him. Or,

2. If

* Jer. x. 10, 11.

2. If the Term *God* ſhould not be *proper* to the Supreme Being alone, then he would not abſolutely be the *one* God, as the Scriptures aſſure us. *There is no God beſides him*; for we can't ſuppoſe the Word *God*, in a proper and ſtrict Senſe, to denote one having Dominion, or inveſted with any high Office, without *neceſſarily* implying, that there be *more* Gods than one, in a proper, ſtrict Senſe.

But I ſhall proceed,

2dly. To prove, that according to the ſtrict and proper Meaning of the Word *God*, it always in Scripture denotes the Supreme Being.

Though there be many who are called Gods in a *lax* and *metaphorical* Senſe, yet there is but one Supreme Being, who therefore, in *Contra-diſtinction* to all other falſe, figurative Gods, is ſtyl'd *abſolutely* God, the true God, great God, mighty God, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords, God over all, and the like; all which eminent Titles are proper to the one Supreme Being alone, and *incommunicable* to any other, they being grounded upon the *Dignity* of the divine Nature, which all others who are called Gods have not, and therefore are not by Nature Gods, but only *nominally* ſo. Now 'tis evident, that our dear Saviour is *abſolutely* called God, *The Word was God*, without any reſtraining Phraſes, ſuch as *I have made thee a God*, or the like. He is alſo called, God with us, Lord God, true God, great God, mighty God, God over all, bleſſed for evermore, *Jehovah*, Almighty, Lord of Glory, King of Kings, Lord of Lords, *Alpha* and *Omega*, the Beginning and End, the Firſt and Laſt; † which is a ſhining Proof that he is in a proper Senſe *God*: A Term that carries with it the grand and auguſt Idea of an inviſible, immaterial Being, of infinite and eternal Perfection, neceſſarily exiſting;

† See Dr. *Waterland*'s Sermons, pag. 197, &c. where all theſe glorious Titles are clearly proved to belong to Chriſt the great Redeemer of the World.

ſupreme over all Creatures, depending on none, before all, above all, and from whom all things come, *Ens optimum maximum*, as ſome of the Heathens themſelves have ſtyl'd him. And 'tis remarkable, that the Scriptures never call any *one* abſolutely definitively God, but him who is ſo by Nature; and therefore the Apoſtle calls the *Worſhip* of the Heathen Deities, a *doing Service to them which are* not *by Nature Gods.* * There is then a God by Nature, and others which are denominated Gods, but really are not ſo, only in the falſe Opinions of their *deluded* Adorers. And tho' Kings and Magiſtrates are cal'ed Gods, becauſe they faintly reſemble the *true* and only God in their borrowed Authority and Power, yet the Term *God* can't ſignify one having *barely* Dominion, becauſe the Perfections of the divine Nature are the *Foundation* of all Dominion; abſtract theſe, and the very Notion of God's being *Creator and Governor* muſt ceaſe. Or, if you ſuppoſe it neceſſary to the very Idea of God that *Dominion* is included in it, then it will follow, that there was a *Space* when God was not; for if the Term *God* be a meer relative Word, expreſſing the Character of one that has Dominion, and nothing elſe, there could be *no God* when there was *no Creature* to govern; and conſequently the Supreme Being is not without a Beginning, nor neceſſarily exiſtent. Upon the whole, Dominion is not included in the *primary* Notion of one that is really God, but only the Conſequence of it. And, as Dr. *Waterland* very juſtly and accurately obſerves, "it muſt "be Dominion ſupreme, and none elſe, which will ſuit "with the Scripture Notion of God; it is not that of a "Governor, a Ruler, a Protector, a Lord, or the like, "but a *Sovereign* Ruler, an *Almighty* Protector, an om-"niſcient omnipreſent Governor, an eternal, immutable, all-

* Gal. iv. 8.

" all-ſufficient Creator, Preſerver, and Protector; what-
" ever falls ſhort of this is not properly in the Scripture
" Notion of God, but is only called ſo by way of Fi-
" gure."* This I ſhall endeavour to illuſtrate by the following Arguments.

Firſt, Wherever we have a Deſcription of God in the Scriptures, there is generally mention made of ſome of thoſe Perfections *which are proper* to the ſupreme Being alone; and conſequently the Word God is not a relative Term, denoting a Perſon having Dominion: Thus to mention no more, in *Exod.* iii. 14. *God ſaid unto* Moſes, *I am that I am*; *which is* a Deſcription of God by his infinite and unchangeable Nature; ſo that the Name *God* is proper only to the ſupreme Being, to one poſſeſs'd of all Perfections.

Secondly, As the Word *Man* denotes the Nature of Man, and *diſtinguiſhes* him from all other Creatures; ſo the Word *God* ſignifies the Nature and Eſſence of God, and *diſtinguiſhes* him from all other Beings whatever: And thus he ſpeaks of himſelf, *for I am God and not Man*, † *i. e.* a Being of a boundleſs compaſſionate Nature, that change not, and not a frail, peeviſh, mutable Man. This declares the *intrinſick Excellency* of the divine Nature, and at the ſame time ſhews the *genuine* Uſe of the Word *God*. But according to our Author, the Senſe of this Place muſt have been, I am a Ruler, a Lord, a Governor, and not a Man; and ſo the beautiful Antitheſis, deſign'd by the Prophet to repreſent the compaſſionate Nature of God, would have been loſt: But what Reaſon can be aſſign'd why the Word *God* ſhould be thought a Term of *Office*, more than the Word *Man*, to which it was oppos'd, I believe none can well gueſs.

Thirdly, If the Term *God* was only a Name of Power and Dominion, then they who attributed to *any Being* ſuch

---

* Defence, p. 62. † Hoſ. xi. 9.

such Dominion and Power, &c. as he was invested with, and honour'd him accordingly, would acknowledge and worship the *true* God, tho' they thought him a *corporeal* or *material* God, or whatever other strange and *odd* Conceptions they might form of him; which is ridiculous to imagine, seeing *he that cometh unto God, must believe that he is* a Being of infinite Perfection and Goodness, and *the Rewarder of them that diligently seek him*; they must also believe him to be a perfect Spirit, and *worship him in Spirit and Truth*; for the superlative Excellency of any Being, and not his Power, is the proper Foundation of all that Worship that is due unto him.

Fourthly, If the Term *God*, in its proper genuine Meaning, denotes one having Dominion, &c. then the Word *God*, in all respects, will be exactly of the *same Import* as the Word *Lord*, which by the Confession of all implies Dominion and Power; and consequently that famous Text, produc'd so often to no purpose, in favour of the *Arians*, *To us there is but one God the Father, and one Lord Jesus Christ*, in their *own Way* of Reasoning, *will* lose all its Force; for one God and one Lord being equivalent Terms, it must follow either that God the Father, and the one Lord Jesus Christ, are the one supreme God, or else that they are two *distinct*, *separate*, *co-ordinate* Gods; for the Term *one God*, and the Term *one Lord*, being of the same Signification, 'tis plain that one God and one Lord, supposing the Text to speak of two, are two Gods, *i. e.* two Beings having *equal* Dominion, seeing our Lord is styl'd emphatically the *one Lord*; and in another Place, the *King of Kings and Lord of Lords*; and how harsh this must sound in the Ears of those that were always taught by the Dictates of Reason, as corrected and improv'd by the superior Light of Revelation, to acknowledge and worship but *one* that is properly absolutely God, I leave the sober Reader to judge. The Author, indeed, fancies he has hit upon a Crevice thro' which he may *creep* out of every such Difficulty.

ficulty. *In the Sense in which he is styl'd one Lord and one Saviour, he is the supreme Lord and Saviour; that is to say, he is the highest of all constituted Lords, there being no Lord in this Sense (tho' there is a God) above him.** But who does not see this to be a meer Quibble and Evasion? for he that is a *constituted* Lord only, nothing can be more obvious than that he is not the *supreme* Lord, but a delegated, commission'd, *inferior* Lord; and can such an inferior Being, with any Propriety, be styl'd the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, which is the distinguishing Character of the great Jehovah? how easily, at this rate, may the Scriptures be moulded into any Form that best pleases? So that it still remains as an impregnable Argument what Dr. *Waterland* had offer'd against the Distinction of a supreme and subordinate God (which the Author here endeavours to refute) "That if God signifies *one supreme* "God, then since all but the supreme God are excluded "from being Gods in any religious Sense, the Conse-"quence is, that an inferior God is no God." To extricate himself from this Dilemma, he refers to *Unity*, p. 42, where he tells us: *I am sure we do not assert two Gods (since two Gods and two supreme Gods are all one) yea on the contrary we most earnestly contend that there is but one supreme God.* But by the Author's Leave, if two Gods and two supreme Gods are all one, it must necessarily follow that an *inferior* God is *no* God; for two Gods, according to his own Notion, necessarily signifies two supreme Gods; *Supremacy* is imply'd in his very *Description* of God, which excludes an inferior God from being God at all, *viz. because he is not supreme*; and if so, the Reader, with half a Glance of his Eye, must see the Justness and Strength of the Doctor's Inference; but the Author adds a very fine and easy

* Reply to Dr. *Waterland*, p. 13.

eaſy Solution: *If we apply* (ſays he) *this kind of Talk to a parallel Caſe, the Doctor himſelf, I ſhould hope, would have Honeſty enough to give it up as vain; God ſays,* Iſa. xliii. 11. Beſides me there is no Saviour, *yet the Man Chriſt Jeſus is called a Saviour.** *In this Caſe the Doctor's Sentence muſt run thus: Since all but the ſupreme Saviour are excluded from being Saviours in any religious Senſe, the Conſequence is, that an inferior Saviour is no Saviour.* Very true, and what then? *Then,* ſays he, *the Doctor muſt allow that the Man Chriſt Jeſus is a Saviour in a religious Senſe, and yet that he is not the ſupreme Saviour, but a Saviour under God.* But if the Doctor ſhould not allow this, nor the Scripture vouch for it, what will be the next Shift? When 'tis ſaid, *Acts* v. 31. *Him hath God exalted with his right Hand* (to be) *a Prince and a Saviour, for to give Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins:* Tho' theſe Words partly refer to the Exaltation of the Man Chriſt Jeſus who was crucify'd, yet they do not imply that he was *in that Character alone* a Saviour under God; but the Perſon who was exalted, being both God and Man, is one ſupreme Saviour with the Father, as he is *one* in Eſſence with him, as to his Godhead; (his humane Nature only affording the Sacrifice of Expiation which the Son of God made for us) he has Power, who is God as well as Man, to give Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins, which is the *Prerogative* of the ſupreme God alone; *for who can forgive Sins but God?* Now unleſs the bleſſed Saviour be conſider'd here *as a mere Man,* it can't anſwer the Author's Purpoſe; and I believe he himſelf, upon a *ſecond* Thought, muſt grant that our Lord is *more* than a mere Man; if not, let him be *ſo honeſt* as to ſpeak out; and if Chriſt is God as well as Man, it remains, for all that he has offer'd, an *unſhaken* Demonſtration, that ſince two Gods, and

---

* Reply, p. 13.

and two ſupreme Gods are all one, an inferior God is no God. But to return from this Digreſſion to the Conſideration of the Meaning of the Term *God*; this I have ſhewn does always in Scripture, *when taken properly*, denote the ſupreme Being; for he that exerciſes ſupreme Dominion muſt be *previouſly* ſuppos'd to have an infinite, ſupreme, and perfect Nature to capacitate him for it (as the Author himſelf can't deny) and he that has this divine infinite Nature, and ſupereminent Perfections, *is God*, whether he had *exercis'd* any Dominion or no; ſo that the Word *God* is expreſſive of this Nature. To which I add, can we reaſonably imagine the Scriptures would deſcribe God by his having Power only, and his bare Relation to his Creatures as a Governor, *&c.* when there are Attributes and Perfections in God, ſuch as infinite Wiſdom, Goodneſs, Love, Eternity, *&c.* all which conſpire to make up the *Notion* of the true God, and can't be abſtracted from him without a *manifeſt* Injury to the Honour of his Majeſty?

But it muſt next be ſeen,

Thirdly, What may be offer'd to obviate the Author's Plea from the relative Terms *my*, *thy*, *ours*, *his*, &c.

He aſſerts, without any preſumptive Proof: *That the Word God, when applied to the Father, ſignifies ſome Relation which Jehovah bears to the Creatures; that he who is related to us muſt be ſuppos'd to have abſolute Perfections; that Chriſt, the expreſs Image of God, ſtands in the ſame Relation to us; that he reſembles his Father, or is the expreſs Image of the inviſible God in every Perfection that the Father poſſeſſes.** Thus far conſiſtent enough with himſelf, and the Varniſh neat; but he adds: *That there is ſtill this Difference, that God the Father has his Being and Perfections*

* Unity, p. 11, 12. compar'd with Page 2 of his Reply.

Perfections from none, *i. e.* that he is a neceſſarily exiſtent Being, independent and ſelf-ſufficient. But are not theſe abſolute Perfections of the Deity? and if the Son reſembles the Father in *every Perfection* he poſſeſſes, is he not *neceſſarily* exiſtent and independent? and if he has the *ſame* Perfections as the Father, and *every* Perfection, he muſt be ſo; unleſs they are the *ſame* and *not the ſame*, *every* Perfection and not *all:* If the Son then is in the ſame proper Senſe God as the Father, by the Author's own Confeſſion, as he poſſeſſes every Perfection, there can be no room for his *Diſtinction* of a ſupreme and ſubordinate God; which being founded entirely upon his Notion of the Term *God*, as implying Dominion, *&c.* which I have ſhewn is foreign and abſurd, it can do him or his Cauſe no Service. As to the relative Terms, my, thy, yours, ours, *&c.* which he urges to back his Pretenſions, I am now to conſider them, and he tells us they are us'd in two Caſes.

Firſt, *When the Words to which they are joyn'd ſignify a Poſſeſſion*, &c. *in this Caſe* (ſays he) *the Name of a thing needs not be a relative Word.* Very well.

Now 'tis obvious to all, that the Word *God* carries this Idea with it, as is evident from *Pſal.* lxxiii. 26. *My Strength and my Heart faileth; but God is the Strength of my Heart, and my Portion for ever.* וחלקי אלהים לעולם, *i. e.* and God *is my Poſſeſſion* for ever. So *Pſal.* xlviii. 14, *this God is our God for ever and ever*; the Saints have God for their God, their Portion, their Inheritance, their Poſſeſſion (a far more durable and certain Poſſeſſion than the fleeting Enjoyments of Time, and infinitely more worthy of the Name, as the Scriptures fully declare) they always can claim him as their own Property. Thus believing *Thomas* appropriates the Saviour to himſelf, in the warmeſt Language of Faith and Prayer, *my Lord and my God:* So that there is no occaſion, by the Author's own Conceſſion, that the Term *God*, when it ſig-

nifies

nifies the Name of any Thing (or Being) we *poſſeſs*, ſhould be a relative; and if he can *in Faith* call God *his* God, I doubt not but he will heartily ſubſcribe to this, that God is the *Portion* of his People; and conſequently, that the Term *God* need not be a bare *relative* Term, himſelf being Judge.

Secondly, *The other Caſe, wherein we uſe the Words my, thy, his, &c. is when they are joyn'd to a Word that ſignifies a Superior, as my King, &c.*

In Anſwer to this,

'Tis only to ſuppoſe the Word God to *include* in it the Idea of an infinite, eternal, uncreated Being, who was pleas'd to become our King and Governor; and then when we ſay *our God*, or *your God*, " it does not barely " mean one who has Dominion over us, but one whoſe " Nature and Perfections are the *Ground* of his Domi- " nion, whoſe Subſtance or Eſſence is as truly divine " and ſupreme as his Dominion."* And thus it is expreſs'd, *Zech.* xiv. 9. *And the Lord Jehovah ſhall be King over all the Earth, in that Day there ſhall be one Lord and his Name one.* So *Iſa.* xxxiii. 22. *The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver.* The Word *Jehovah* is of an *abſolute Signification*, denoting the divine Nature, and yet you ſee *Jehovah* is conſider'd in the *Relation* of a King, Judge, and Lawgiver. Thus the great Redeemer, who with the Father and Holy Ghoſt is *ſupreme* God, is *Jehovah*, and has with the Father ſupreme Dominion, and therefore may be ſtyl'd *one Lord* in the *higheſt* Senſe, *even Lord of Lords and King of Kings.*† So that the Term *God* is properly expreſſive *only* of the divine Nature, notwithſtanding he that is the true God, the ſupreme Being, may ſtand in ſome relation to his Creatures.

The next thing the Author deſcants upon is the Doctor's Diſtinction of the Term *God*, taken ſometimes *eſſen-*

---

* See *Fiddes*, Vol. 1. p. 387. † Rev. xvii. 14.

essentially, and sometimes *personally*, which, he observes, is *cunningly devis'd, not reveal'd, and will answer no* End: And therefore to represent the Fallacy of this Distinction, the Author aims very aukwardly to hook in *Joh.* i. 1. where the Term *God* is only taken *personally* to imply *both* Senses of the Word; and thus runs his Comment. *The Word was with a Person having the divine Nature, and the Word was a Person having the divine Nature.* What is the Author's Inference? *God is three Persons, that is, the divine Essence is three Persons*; whereas it shou'd have been, the Word was a Person having the divine Nature, which is the obvious Conclusion from the Premises; for 'tis an invariable Principle in Logick, that the Premises ought to contain the Conclusion; and thus the Doctor, very consistent with this Sense of the Term *God*, paraphrases the Text. " In the Beginning, before there was " any Creature, and consequently from all Eternity, " the Word existed, and the Word was no distant sepa- " rate Power estrang'd from God, or unacquainted with " him, but he was with God, and himself also very " God, not another God, but another Person only of " the same Nature, Substance and Godhead,* *&c.*

This is a fair and genuine Interpretation of the Text, wherein the Term *God* is taken *personally* for one possessed of Deity: But seeing the Author is for fastening an Absurdity where there is no Appearance of one, let us see how the Text † would run according to his Sense of the Word God.

" In the Beginning, before the World had a Being, " was the Word, and the Word was a Person having " *Dominion*, and the Word was with a Person having " Dominion, and the Word was a Person having Domi- " nion, *&c.*

Our Adversaries themselves acknowledge, that he existed *before all Worlds* (and by the way, whether a Duration

---

* *Waterl.* Serm. p. 17. † *Joh.* i. 1.

ration before Time is not Eternal, they had beſt think, or aſſign any poſſible *Medium* between Time and Eternity.) Now if our Bleſſed Lord had an Exiſtence before the Creation of the World, as is very evident from his *Creating all things*, unleſs the Cauſe be after the Effect, he could not be God according to their Senſe of the Term, *i. e.* a Perſon having Dominion or Office; for he could have no *Relation* to the Creatures *before* they were made, nor *Dominion* over them when they were not; ſo that the Term *God*, when apply'd to our Saviour, muſt be proper and ſtrict to denote his infinite Divine Nature, his Co-eternity, and Co-equality to the Father, and his *Supremacy* over all. This Text then will not ſerve his purpoſe. The next he cites is, *To us there is but one God the Father,--which according to the Doctor* (he ſays) *will run thus; To us there is but one Divine Eſſence, the Father, which I ſuppoſe no orthodox Man will aſſert.*

To reſcue this Place from the Author's Note, and ſet it in a true Light, 'twill be proper here to conſider the Deſign of it; what Turn is generally given by Expoſitors to it, and what other Meaning may be truly fix'd on the Words conſiſtent with it.

1*ſt*, 'Tis obvious that the Intent of the Apoſtle was to ſhew that to us Chriſtians there is but *one God*, contrary to the Polytheiſm of the Pagans, *who had Gods many and Lords many.** Shou'd we therefore ſuppoſe the Father a *Supreme God*, and the Lord Jeſus a *ſubordinate* God, ſeparate from the one ſupreme God, how weak and invalid would the Apoſtle's Reaſoning have been; nay, contradictory and *repugnant* to the very Deſign of it? for this had been proving there is but *one* God, becauſe there are *two*, one *uncreated* God, and another *made* God, one a God by *Nature*, and another by *Office*. Or if we ſhou'd take the Term *God* to ſignify, only, one having Dominion, this Argument to prove one God would have been equal-

* *Verſe* 5.

ly foreign and impertinent, as has been already prov'd. Therefore

2dly, The Design of the inspir'd Writer being to establish the Belief and Worship of one God, let us see what Construction is generally put by the Trinitarians reconcileable to their Faith of *three Persons in one Godhead*, and thus the Words may be paraphras'd: "To us there "is but one supreme Being, whom we own and wor- "ship, which subsists in three Persons, but is primari- "ly to be consider'd in the Person of the Father, as "the Root and Fountain of the Deity, not excluding "whatever essentially and *inseparably* belongs to it, *&c.*" So Dr. *Waterland* observes upon the Place;* "All that "can be reasonably gather'd from it is, that the Father "is there emphatically stil'd one God, but without De- "sign to exclude the Son from being God also, as the "Son is emphatically stil'd one Lord, but without De- "sign to exclude the Father from being Lord also." This is very justly retorted, and with the utmost Force of Reason urg'd; for if the Words, *to us there is but one God the Father*, exclude the Son from being God, by the very same way of reasoning, *to us there is but one Lord*, would exclude the Father from being Lord; whereas if the Father and Son be consider'd as one God in Essence, the Difficulty on each Side will be fairly adjusted; for according to this 'tis suppos'd that when the Father is called the one God, and there is no Mention made of the other two Persons, they are sufficiently intimated, and virtually and implicitly understood, in the Word Father, which necessarily implies that he has a Son of the same Nature and Perfections; and when the Son is here call'd *one Lord*, 'tis not in *Opposition* to the supreme Dominion of the Father, any more than the Father's being styl'd *one God excludes* the Divinity of the Son; but they are so differently styl'd on account of their *personal* and more peculiar

* *Defence*, p. 8.

peculiar Characters, in Oppoſition to Gods many and Lords many. This is the uſual Turn given to the Words, and ſufficient to ſilence all Objections; particularly to obviate the Author's, the Word Father being taken perſonally. But I ſhall offer another Explication, which perhaps may be leſs liable to Exception.

3*dly*, That the Term *Father* in this Text is not taken for the firſt Perſon of the Trinity, but *eſſentially* incluſive of all three Perſons as the one God, Author of all things, and *Father* of all Men. And then the Words may run thus:

To us there is but one living and true God, the Creator and Father of all, of whom are all things created out of nothing, and in *him* we live, move and breath, and all things ſubſiſt, and one Mediator the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, *&c.*

To confirm this Interpretation, let it be obſerv'd that the Text ſays barely the Father, and not the Father of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, or any other Phraſe or Word in the Text or Context, to *limit* it to that Senſe, as in other Places of Scripture, as may be ſeen in the Margin.* And further let it be taken notice, that the Word *Father* ſignifies the *Creator of all things*, as is evident from *Mal.* ii. *v.* 10. *Have we not all one Father, and did not one God create us?* Now nothing is more obvious than that the Son of God was our Creator, *who made all things*, and *by whom all things conſiſt*. So alſo was the Spirit, and conſequently Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, as the one Creator is the *one God and Father, of whom are all things*; and this is plain from *Eph.* iv. *v. 6. One God and Father of all* (*i. e.* Creator of all) *who is above all, and thro' all, and in you all*, which the Ancients generally underſtood of the whole Trinity; and 'tis certain the *Jews* had a Notion *prevailing* among them in our Saviour's Time that God was their Father. So that the God of the *Jews*, who is alſo the God of the

 Gentiles,

* Rom. xv. 6. 2 Cor. i. 3. Eph. i. 3. Col. i. 3. *&c.*

Gentiles, may be juſtly ſtyl'd God the Father; *We have one Father, even God*; * and even the Heathens could ſay, *We are his Off-ſpring*: † So that the Term *God*, when join'd with the Word Father, does not *always* denote the firſt Perſon of the Trinity, but is taken eſſentially; whence 'tis poſſible that *an Orthodox Man*, as the Author is pleas'd to term it, may ſay, without any Abſurdity, to us there is but one Eſſence, the Father, the Term *Father* not ſignifying the Father of our Lord Jeſus in a *peculiar Senſe*, but the Creator and Father of all, as will be ſhewn more diſtinctly.

(*2dly.*) That the latter part of the Text is to be interpreted of the Mediator, is not to be doubted.

This will appear if we conſult only the fifth Verſe, where 'tis ſaid, that the Heathens had *Lords many*, i. e. Dæmons, who they thought preſided over humane Affairs, and were Mediators between the Gods and Men. Thus the Author in his *Reply* ‡ explains it himſelf, *and Lords Mediators many*. Contrary to this, as we Chriſtians worſhip but one God, ſo we have but one Mediator; *for there is one God, and one Mediator between God and Man, the Man Chriſt Jeſus*; ¶ who we are told *is made Lord*, ** who muſt be therefore God as well as Man, or elſe could not be imagined *capable* of ſuſtaining ſo high, grand and peculiar a Character, as the one ſovereign and only Lord; *for who is God ſave the Lord?* †† Since then there is no God but the Lord, and our Saviour is emphatically ſtyl'd the *one Lord*, and the *Lord of Lords*, he muſt, as to his higheſt Capacity, be in Eſſence and Power *equal* to the Father, and ſo has a *natural Right* of Government, as God, *by whom all things conſiſt*, as well as a *diſpenſatory* Power, in the Character of Mediator and God-Man united; and if we conſider our dear Lord under this complex Character as reveal'd,

viz.

---

* Joh. viii. 41. † Acts xvii. 28. ‡ Page 23. ¶ 1 Tim. ii. 5.
** Acts ii. 36. †† 2 Sam. xxii. 32.

viz. God manifeſt in the Fleſh, 'twill anſwer all the Difficulties which the Author of *Unity* pretends to ſtart; and will equally ſerve what he produces the Diſtinction of *a ſupreme and ſubordinate God* for, far more agreeable to the *Tenor* of Scripture, the Nature and *Reaſon* of things, and the *Honour* of our bleſſed Redeemer.

As to what he adds, *That the Word God is never to be taken otherwiſe than perſonally — from the uſe of the Pronouns, I, me, thou, thee, him, his*, &c. it can be of no force at all; for when the Scripture ſpeaks of God, without any particular reſpect to the Diſtinction of Perſons, it muſt ſpeak but of one in the ſingular Number, becauſe God is, and cannot *but be*, one. Agreeable to this God ſays, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before me*, which being ſpoken of the one God, incluſive of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, and only *excluſive* of all the Gods of the Heathens; and as the Scripture repreſents theſe three as the one God, equal in Dignity, Power, *&c.* the divine Eſſence being but one, the ſupreme Being may be certainly, and with the utmoſt Propriety, app'y'd to by his Creatures in all the Acts of their Worſhip and Adoration, as the one living and true God, by the *ſingular Pronouns, thou, thee*, &c. Hence, entirely conſonant to the Language of the ſacred Oracles, when we pray unto God, or praiſe him for his abundant Mercies, (as the Object of religious Worſhip is but one) we generally addreſs the ſupreme Being with, O thou moſt High, we beſeech *thee*, &c. What ſeems to lead the Author into this Miſtake is, he prepoſterouſly borrows his Idea of the one God, not from *plain* Scripture, but from his *own Conceptions* of a humane Perſon; and becauſe the Terms *I, me, thou, he*, &c. are, according to the ordinary, though not *conſtant Cuſtom* of Language, applicable to one Perſon, he imagines when they are ſpoken of God, it implies that he is one Perſon: But as there is no Example in Nature of three Perſons who are eſſentially and undividedly one, tho' this manner of ſpeaking concerning God may not

in every reſpect be conformable to the Modes of ſpeaking among Men, becauſe they have no Example of ſuch a Unity, upon which account alone (tho' the three Perſons, when ſpoken of as ſuch, require the plural Number) yet conſider'd as inſeparably join'd in the divine Nature, they are one God; and we may apply ſingular Pronouns to the one God, without any Breach of Grammar, or the common Forms of Speech; it being proper to our Language, as well as others, to ſpeak of *one* in the ſingular Number. And conſequently, the Author's Inference from the *perſonal Characters, I, thou*, &c. which are applied to God, can be nothing like an Argument againſt a *Plurality of Perſons* in the one Godhead. For, as one well obſerves, " ſince plain Reaſons may be " given, why God is more Perſons than one, and no " plain Reaſons can be given, why any one of the Tri- " nity is more Perſons than one; therefore it is, that " the Scripture-Arguments, to prove any one of the " Trinity to be one Perſon, does not equally prove that " God is one Perſon." *

I ſhould now examine the Method which the Author takes to reconcile the Unity of God with the Divinity of Chriſt; but I muſt leave him at preſent, and return to the Appendix.

---

* Anſwer to ſome Quæries printed at *Exon*, pag. 7.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

The second Objection of the Appendix *against that Argument for the Divinity of Christ, deduced from his being styl'd* the Son of God, *and upon that Account thought* equal to God *by the* Jews, *considered; and* John v. 18. *plac'd in such a Light, as is agreeable to the* Character *of the blessed Jesus, and the* Tenor *of the sacred Writings.*

HAVING canvass'd this Author's first Objection, and shewn his Reasonings to be inconclusive, I think it time to pursue him to his other Refuges. And the next Step he takes is to weaken the Strength of that Text in *John* v. 18. † which is frequently, and not *unjustly* alledg'd to prove, that in Christ's being *the Son* of God, is implied his being of the *same* Nature or Essence with God; as the *Jews* really thought he *made himself equal to God, because he said that God was his Father.* In order then to rescue this Text from the very forc'd Turn the Author gives it, I shall represent fairly the *Consequence* of his Explication, which, if we suppose *just*, must appear to every *unbyass'd Enquirer*, to be inconsistent with the Character of our Lord; and next of all shall endeavour to put it in such a View, as is agreeable to his Character, and his reasoning with the *Jews* in this and other Places.

1st. I shall fairly represent the Consequence of his Explication, which, if we suppose just, must appear to be *inconsistent* with the Character of our blessed Lord.

† Appendix, pag. 35.

Now nothing can be more open and obvious, than that our Saviour is describ'd in the inspired Writings to be *meek and lowly*, a Person of the utmost Humility and Condescension; one that was not of a vain, aspiring Temper; that never boasted of himself, or thirsted after Grandeur; but though *in the Form of God, and the Brightness of his Glory, made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the Form of a Servant*, &c. This being undeniably his Character, either upon some Occasions he asserted of himself things that must savour of the utmost Vainglory and Ambition, or else things that must necessarily imply that he was the eternal Son of God, and equal to the Father. Now every one in his Wits must be forced to acknowledge, that the *highest Degree* of Ostentation lies in *affecting* divine Honours, or for a meer Creature to be thought a God. How rigorously and severely did God punish *Herod*, for being only pleas'd with the People's stupid Folly in crying out, the *Voice of God, and not of Man*? * And could our Lord, ever consistent with the Character of Innocency, Meekness, and Humility itself, presume to say, that God was his Father, Πατέρα ἴδιον, his proper Father, and so make himself equal with God, or what is equivalent, *I and my Father are one*; † which the *Jews* understood in such a Sense, that immediately they took up Stones to have stoned him for a Blasphemer? § What possibly could be the Meaning of so much Zeal, of so much Indignation? Not surely for saying he had *Unity of Consent* with his Father (as our Adversaries gloss the Words) Thus much might have been said of a Prophet, or any other good and holy Man. The *Jews*, 'tis plain, understood it of a higher Union, even *Identity of Power and Nature*, and Equality with God; and being jealous of every thing that savour'd of Idolatry, or a Plurality of Gods, and believing he was not the *Messiah*, were the more

* Acts xii. 22. † Joh. x. 30. § Ver. 31.

more alarm'd at this Saying of our Lord. But, says the Author very warily, *Supposing that the* Jews *thought this their Charge just, and that his calling God his Father, did imply in it a making himself equal with him, was there a necessary and inseparable Connection between their Judgment and the real Truth of things?* Well, let it be suppos'd that the *Jews* misunderstood the Drift of his Argument, and too hastily concluded him equal to the Father, can it be ever thought that the meek Saviour would not have immediately *explain'd* himself, to prevent so dangerous and *fatal* a Misconstruction? Could an *Ambassador*, in Justice to his Master, ever mislead a foreign Court, to whom he was sent, into a Belief that he was of *equal Dignity* and Dominion as his Master, and be clear'd of Arrogance and Presumption, if he did not, upon the first Notice of the Mistake, *rectify* their wrong Apprehensions? And can we think the lowly and lovely Jesus would have left any in such a pernicious Error? Did he then *attempt* undeceiving them? No, instead of this he confirms them in their Sentiments, as being God's Envoy and Ambassador to the Children of Men; not barely representing his adorable Majesty, Dignity and Dominion, but *possessing* it originally, indivisibly, and inseparably, with him; and therefore he readily asks them, *what it was they were about to stone him for?* the *Jews* answer directly and plainly, *for Blasphemy, because that thou being a Man makest thy self God*, ver. 33. This was home to the purpose. And here our Lord might have fairly nick'd an Opportunity to have denied it, had it not been so; (especially seeing this Discourse was entred upon at the Request of the *Jews*) who came round about him, and desired him not to hold them in *Suspence* any longer, *but to tell them plainly whether he was the Christ, or no*, ver. 24. But does he deny, or wave the Charge? Does he say 'twould be Blasphemy in him to assume an Equality with God? Nothing less; he defends himself, and proves it to be no Blasphemy for him to say he was

th

the Son of God equal to his Father; *Jesus answered them, is it not written in your Law, I said, ye are Gods? if ye call'd them Gods, unto whom the Word of God came, and the Scriptures cannot be broken, say ye of him, whom the Father hath sanctified and sent into the World, Thou blasphemest, because I said I am the Son of God?** This Argument is grounded upon the infinite Distance and Imparity between the Office of a *Mediator*, and the Office of a *Magistrate*, between the only begotten Son of God, who is one with his Father, and the Sons of Men, who are but his inferior Deputies: And 'tis as if he had said, if Kings and Magistrates are *figuratively* called Gods, only because they have some *faint and remote* Resemblance of the divine Majesty, in respect of their Office, how much more may I be properly called God, who am the *substantial and eternal* Son of God? And so have a proper *Right* to the Name, having been one with my Father from all Eternity, sanctify'd, and now sent into the World, and say ye of him, who hath such a strict and *indisputable Claim* to the Title of *God*, *Thou blasphemest*? If you won't believe *my Words*, yet the regard due to those *mighty Works*, which you see wrought by me, which are a convincing Evidence that the Father *acts in me, and I in him*, and that there is the same divine Nature, and *Principle of Operation*, in us both, *may* satisfy you of the Truth of what I say. † This the *Jews* understood of his defending his former Assertion, that he and his Father were one in the high Sense they took the Word in, and therefore *they sought again to take him* §, *because he made himself equal to God*; as will more fully appear under the next Particular. In the mean while I must trace the Author. *Nor can it be proved*, says he, *that by equal with God they meant having the same individual, numerical Nature with God*, i. e. *that they charg'd him with making*

* Ver. 34, 35, 36. † Ver. 37, 38. § Ver. 39.

king himself the self same Being, whom they charged him of arrogating an Equality with; in other Words, with making himself the same Being with the one supreme Being, and yet another and distinct Being from him.

Here the Author would gradually and softly steal upon us a Contradiction in Terms, and then gravely asks whether it can be prov'd: To which Insinuation I answer, none ever pretended to prove, that Christ is the *same Being* with the *one supreme God*, and yet another *distinct Being* from him; and if the *Jews* had thought he intended this, they would rather have left him, as one of no great Brains, than levell'd a *Charge of Blasphemy* against him. This can be only owing to the Author's own false, and yet riveted Notion, that the Son cannot be the supreme God in opposition to all Idols, and so of the same Nature with the Father, unless he be the *very Person* of the Father: 'Twas never asserted by those of *more Zeal than Judgment*, nor ever entered into their Hearts, that the Son was the *same* Being with the Father, and *another* distinct Being from him; for tho' we contend that he hath the same undivided Nature with God the Father, he can't, in the reason of things, be a separate distinct Being from him, but only a Person *distinctly subsisting in, and not abstracted from* the same Godhead, and consequently equal in all *essential* Perfections; and therefore when we say that the Son is equal to the Father in Power, Goodness, Wisdom, or any other Perfection, this is only to note the Distinction *of the Persons*, and not the Distinction of *the Power, Goodness and Wisdom*, as 'tis inherent in *different* Subjects; or else 'tis to shew that one Person doth not exceed another in *degrees* of Power, Goodness, and Wisdom, and all other essential Attributes; for as we believe all three have the same *infinite* Essence, we safely conclude there are no Degrees in that which is *strictly* infinite; and therefore when we consider *any* of these Attributes *referring* to the divine Essence, which is *common* to all three Persons, we usually say it is the *same* Power,

Power, Goodneſs, and Wiſdom, &c. that is in Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt: But when we conſider theſe Attributes, as they are *prædicated of the Perſons* who ſubſiſt in this Eſſence, we ſay this Perſon is *equal* to that in Power, &c. becauſe all theſe eſſential Perfections equally belong to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. So that the Author here very widely miſſes the Mark; and if previouſly ſenſible of it, he acted a little diſingenuouſly, to faſten a Meaning on the Argument of his Brethren, who utterly deny the thing, diſown the Conſequence with both Hands, and which never, by all the Art of Men, can be made good againſt them. However, having thus darken'd the Argument, by jumbling diſtinct Being and Perſon together, one an *abſolute*, the other a *relative* Term, which is really enough to *nonplus the plain Chriſtian, who can't diſtinguiſh between Sophiſtry and good Reaſoning*, he proceeds to diſcover a Secret, which he opens by a ſolemn Queſtion.

But why muſt the Jews *be thought good Interpreters of our Lord's Words, who were confeſſedly his inveterate Enemies, and conſtant Perverters of them to an ill Senſe, whenever they had the leaſt Colour for it; and who ſought continually to betray him in his Speech, that they might find ſome Matter of plauſible Accuſation againſt him?*

I anſwer,

Granting this a Deſign to enſnare him, and the whole Charge the effect of Spight, and whatever elſe may be added, and what will be the Conſequence? plainly this, that our bleſſed Lord tamely and quietly ſubmitted to the Charge; and by not diſowning it, if he was not truly ſo, to the great Diſhonour of the ſupreme Being, implicitly perſiſted *in aſſuming* Godhead to himſelf. But can it ever enter into our Thoughts, that a meer Creature, *knowing* his Original, ſhould arrogate this to himſelf; and yet *God bear Witneſs to him*, not only by Miracles, and Wonders, and Signs, but by a direct Voice from Heaven, ſaying, *This is my beloved Son*,

Son, in whom I am well pleased, hear him? Matth. iii. 17. Now if Christ was not the eternal Son of God, equal to the Father, as the *Jews* thought by this Phrase he made himself, and which he aims to confirm them in the Belief of, by the following Words; one would think all his Designs must have been blasted, the Religion he was going to settle in the World come to nothing, his Disciples be all scattered, filled with Shame and the utmost Confusion. But the glorious Design flourish'd, the Religion of a crucify'd God, without *any Artifice or Force*, spread from Sea to Sea, from Shore to Shore, even to the *utmost Bounds* of the habitable World; his Disciples strenuosly propagated the Cause, even *in the Face* of Jealousy, Anger, and Rage itself, with *astonishing* Success; they faithfully bore witness to his Divinity, with a steady, manly, and undaunted Spirit; and, in short, in all their Writings, made use of such sublime and lofty Expressions concerning Christ as God, and that by such a *continued Strain* of Words and Phrases, as seem like a Torrent to over-bear us; Expressions so strong and nervous, as hardly to be soften'd by the Skill of Criticks: I say, if we impartially consider this, and more that might be urg'd of the like Nature, we must be forc'd to bewail it, that our blessed Lord, which is a startling Thought! acted the Part of the vilest Impostor imaginable; and that his Apostles, instead of being plain, sincere, honest, inspired Men, were no better than common Cheats, and a *Cabal* of Knaves that actually *imposed* upon a credulous World; which is enough to vacate all their Writings, and tempt any Man of Reason to turn Apostate from the Christian Institutes, as a meer Heap of Forgeries; for when those, who deny the Godhead of Christ, perceive what *high Titles* of Sovereignty and Divinity the Scriptures every where give him, they are naturally led to think the *sacred Writings to be contradictory and spurious*, as affirming him to be lowly and meek, and yet assuming divine Characters, and divine Honours,

Honours, which, if not truly due unto him, as they believe they are not, they may, without *any Pauſe*, drop into Deiſm, and be ever loſt in that thick Cloud of Error.

Theſe are the horrid Conſequences of the Author's *Explication*, which therefore can't well be thought genuine; but ſuch is the Magick of Prepoſſeſſion, that he is led to offer the moſt ſlender Proof in Vindication of this ſtrain'd and uneaſy Turn which he gives the Words; an Argument, that inſtead of making for him, if duly weigh'd, muſt *overthrow* his whole Plea. His Words are: *Indeed, as it happens, the Anſwer which our Saviour gave to this Charge, plainly ſhews it to have been a Calumny; and that in theſe Words*, My Father worketh hitherto, and I work, *which were the Foundation of it, he deſign'd nothing leſs than to aſſume to himſelf an Equality with the Father.*

'Tis plain, our Lord intended by theſe Words only to excuſe himſelf as innocent of any ſuch *Breach* of the *Sabbath*, as the *Jews* charged him with, for *healing the impotent Man*; and he offers, in Vindication of his Conduct on this Occaſion, this Argument, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work*, q. d. God, my Father, from whoſe reſting on the ſeventh Day you derive, by his Command, your Celebration of the *Sabbath*, who can interpret his own Laws, does not ſtop the *Operations* of his Providence on that Day, but *hitherto* continues to preſerve and govern all things, and *exerciſe* Works of Mercy on that Day as well as others, without any *Violation* of the *Sabbath*; and I, who am the Son of God, alſo work by the *ſame Energy*, upholding all things by the Word of my Power;* and ſurely my miraculous Works of Goodneſs on the *Sabbath* Day can't be chargeable with any Breach of it, any more than the Works of Providence, which go on every Day without Intermiſſion; *my Father worketh hitherto, and I work.* It ought to be obſerved, that our

* Heb. i. 3.

our Lord does not say, I may work Miracles of Mercy on *Sabbath* Days as well as other Days, because the Precept for observing it does not *forbid* Works of Necessity and Charity, as he had alledg'd in answer to the like Charge in other Places; but the Father worketh hitherto, ἕως ἄρτι, even from the Beginning to this time, κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι, *and I work hitherto*; which shews, that as Christ created all things with his Father, so he supports and governs all with him; he works *undividedly* with him, having eternally one and the same Virtue, Majesty, Substance, Will, and Operation. Supposing then these Words the Foundation of the Charge, as the Author says it is, the *Jews* Inferences, that our Lord intended an Equality with God, had not been strain'd. But I conceive 'twas meerly his calling God his Father, that drew upon him this Charge of Blasphemy, which they took in such a high Sense, as to imply that God was *his own proper* Father, and which really our Lord *intended* they should, as will appear,

2*dly*, By placing the Text in such a Light as is consistent with our Lord's Character, and his reasoning with the *Jews* in this and other Places of Scripture.

When our Lord called God his Father, the *Jews* immediately receiv'd it in such a peculiar Sense, *that he was the proper Son of God*;* and therefore charged him with making himself equal to God, meerly upon this account, as is as plain as Words can make it; *Therefore the* Jews *sought the more to kill him, because he not only had broken the* Sabbath, *but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.*† This shews that a double Charge was commenc'd against him, one for his breaking the *Sabbath*, and another for saying God was his own Father; both which our Lord vindicates himself from, not by *denying* it flatly, but shewing the things, whereof he

* Ver. 17. † Ver. 18.

he was accus'd, to be *consistent* with the Honour of God, and his *Mission* to the lost Sheep of *Israel*; and withal, their Sentiments to be just. Agreeable to this, when the High Priest ask'd whether he was the Son of the Blessed;* our Lord *answered, I am*; which was a punctual and positive Affirmation of it, such as was consistent with his Character, as he was God as well as Man, and no way intrenching upon the Honour of his Father, seeing he was one *that counted it no Robbery to be equal with God*; and we may easily know in what Sense the High-Priest put the Question, and receiv'd the Answer, by his *renting of his Cloaths*, and condemning the Lord of Life and Glory for Blasphemy. 'Twas now no time for our Lord to shift the Question, when in view of an ignominious and cruel Death; nor could it be imagin'd he would hide the Truth from them, when so solemnly adjur'd by the living God, and when his explaining himself (had he not asserted what they thought Blasphemy) would have silenc'd them all, and cut off *every Pretension* against him that might touch his Life. So that by the direct Answer our Lord gave, *I am* the Son of the Blessed, he must mean as they thought, that he was the proper Son of God, who had the same Nature and Power with the Father, and therefore was *able* to do, and *actually did* the same Works; which I have shewn you is the *true* Sense of those Words, *My Father worketh hitherto, and I work*; and the Design of our Lord's reasoning with the *Jews*, who certainly thought so themselves; and therefore not barely from the Force of Calumny and malicious Intention, but out of *Prejudice* to his Person, (who they thought was not what they apprehended he said he was) they pleaded the Law against him as one that deserved to die for Blasphemy. *The* Jews *answered him, we have a Law, and by our Law he ought*

* Mark. xiv. 16.

*ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God.** Observe the Reason, not because he made himself a *King*, and so was guilty of *Treason* against *Cæsar*; but because he made himself the *Son of God*, and so was guilty of *Blasphemy*,† and deserv'd to be *stoned to Death*, which before they had often threaten'd him. Now if our Saviour had not meant that he was the true Son of God, a Son equal to the Father, and one with him; and if the *Jews* did not take him in this Sense, they could have had *nothing* to accuse him of Blasphemy. Against this, indeed, Dr. *Clark* observes, that the Charge of Blasphemy, here alledg'd against our blessed Lord, "was only "for his taking upon himself to be that *Son of Man*, of "whom *Daniel* had propheſied, chap. vii. 13. and that "the Law, by which he ought to die, did not refer to "*Lev.* xxiv. 15. but to that, *Deut.* xviii. 20. which threa-"tens Death to him that shall presume to speak a Word "in the Name of God, without being really sent by "him."** In which Objection there are two things observable, *First*, That the Doctor acknowledges the Title of Son of God was peculiarly and *emphatically* ascribed to the Christ, or Messiah. *Secondly*, That the Charge of Blasphemy against our Lord was meerly upon the account of the *Jews* thinking *he was not sent of God, and yet presuming to speak in his Name.* In Answer to the first, 'tis highly reasonable to think, with the Doctor, that the *Jews* had a Notion, that their Messiah should be the Son of God, but in a more sublime Sense than as the Christ; for it does not appear that Christ and Son of God are synonymous Terms, but different Titles denoting the same Person, consider'd under different respects, the Title of Christ denoting his *Relation* to the People as their *King*; and the Title of Son of God, his *peculiar Relation* to God;†† and this *Nathaniel*

F confesses,

---

* John xix. 7. † Levit. xxiv. 16. ** Reply to the Objections of *Robert Nelson*, Esq; p. 150. †† See *Fiddes*, Vol. 2. p. 409.

confeſſes, *Rabbi, thou art the Son of God, thou art the King of* Iſrael;* and when our Lord tells *Martha, Whoſoever liveth and believeth on me ſhall never die, believeſt thou this? She ſaith unto him, yea, Lord, I believe that thou art the Chriſt, the Son of God, which ſhould come into the World:*† And with this, as a *Falſhood*, the *Jews* upbraided and revil'd him at his Crucifixion; ſaying, *Thou that deſtroyeſt the Temple, and buildeſt it in three Days, ſave thyſelf; if thou be the Son of God, come down from the Croſs.*** And thus one of the *Malefactors*, that was hang'd with him, *rail'd on him, ſaying, if thou be the Chriſt, ſave thyſelf and us.*†† All which plainly intimates that the *Jews* of old look'd upon their Meſſias (tho' they may now deny it) as the proper Son of God, and equal to the Father. Agreeable to theſe Sentiments, the other Thief, *ver.* 42. applies himſelf to him for Salvation and eternal Life, *ſaying, Lord, remember me when thou comeſt into thy Kingdom. And Jeſus ſaid unto him, verily I ſay unto thee, to day ſhalt thou be with me in Paradiſe.* And in what more *authoritative* Manner could he have ſpoken, ſuppoſing him God? Upon the whole 'tis manifeſt, that there was a prevailing Opinion among ſome of the *Jews*, that their Meſſiah ſhould be the Son of God; and according to this Expectation, our Saviour endeavour'd, by degrees, to repreſent himſelf in this amiable and divine Character, that ſo he might raiſe the Thoughts of the *Jewiſh* Nation in general, above the low Hopes of a mere temporal King, to a juſt Idea of the Son of *God*, whoſe Nature was truly divine, and whoſe Kingdom was properly ſpiritual; and, as Dr. *Fiddes* very juſtly hints, " tho' he forbids his Diſciples " to publiſh, that he was the Chriſt, or Meſſiah, be- " cauſe the Generality would take it in a wrong Senſe, " interpreting it of King Meſſiah (*i. e.* of a Temporal " Prince) according to the current Prejudice of that " Time;

---

* John i. 49. † John xi. 26, 27. ** Matth. xxvii. 40.
†† Luke xxiii. 39.

" Time; yet we no where find that he lays any Re-
" ſtraint upon them from publiſhing him to be the Son of
" God."* Now if this was the Notion of the *Jews*, that their Meſſiah ſhould be alſo the Son of God, as they thought our Lord *was not* the Meſſiah, they might be eaſily led to charge him with *Blaſphemy*, for aſſuming a Character that would be really blaſphemous in any one to *aſſert of himſelf*, if it did not belong to him; and upon this Foundation, and no other, could they well proceed in levelling an Accuſation of this Nature againſt him; and conſequently, the Doctor's Objection can be here of no uſe. For,

Secondly, What is further obſervable in the Doctor's Objection, is, that the Charge of Blaſphemy againſt our Lord, was merely upon the account of the *Jews* thinking he *was not ſent of God, and yet preſuming to ſpeak in his Name.* But this can't be the Ground of it; becauſe a Prophet might propheſy falſely, *or run before he is ſent*, without being judg'd guilty of Blaſphemy. I can't find the leaſt *Mention* made of this Crime, as riſing ſo high, nor any ſuch *Puniſhment*, as to be ſton'd to Death, inflicted on ſuch a Prophet, which is peculiarly appropriated to the Crime of Blaſphemy; and which therefore the *Jews* often attempted to execute upon our Saviour, for ſaying *that God was his Father*, and ſo was equal to God. That they really believ'd he intended nothing elſe, may be gather'd from *Acts* iii. 14, 15. where *Peter* tells the *Jews*, *that they, and their Rulers, killed the Prince of Life through Ignorance*, i. e. they were inſenſible of the *Dignity* of his Perſon whom they crucify'd, tho' *he ſaid* he was the Son of God, and they *underſtood* what he meant; they imagin'd he *falſely* uſurp'd the Title; and upon this account, at his Tryal, they bring in an Indictment of Blaſphemy againſt him, which was the *Occaſion*

* Vol. 1. p. 413.

of his Condemnation and Death; but *had they known* what he really was, and what they conceived he only pretended to be, *the Son of God, they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory.** 'Tis true, our Lord had given all the convincing Proofs of it possibly, by those *stupendious Miracles of Love* he wrought among them; but they resisted all rational Conviction, and persisted in their Obstinacy, Prejudices and Unbelief, which put so fatal an Accent upon their Sin. Nothing then, I conceive, can be much clearer, than that our Lord design'd to shew that he was one with his Father (as the *Jews* understood it) in this, and in other Places of Scripture. Thus when *Philip* † requested our Lord to shew him the Father, he answers him, *he that hath seen me hath seen the Father*;** intimating to us, that Christ was a Son in so eminent a Manner, as to be one and the same God with the Father. In the next Verse he goes on to open and enforce this by way of Expostulation; *Believest thou not that I am in the Father and the Father, in me? q. d.* you have such sensible Arguments to confirm you in the Belief of it, both from my *own Mouth* expressly, and from my *Works*, which are the *same* as my Father's, that I wonder you can any longer doubt of it: *The Words that I speak unto you, I speak not of myself; but the Father that dwelleth in me, he doth the Works.* ‡ And therefore our Lord presses it home upon him; *Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me; or else believe me for the very Works sake.* Which shews that our Redeemer wrought his Miracles by a Virtue proceeding *from himself*, and the Power of his *Father* and the *Holy Ghost* at the same time; because he and his Father, &c. were *one in Power*; and tho' it be said, *that he who believeth should do the same or greater Works*;†† (which may unawares lead some to think Christ did all by the same derived Power from God, as the Apostles did) if we only consult

* 1 Cor. ii. 8. † John xiv. 8. ** Ver. 9. ‡ Ver. 11.
†† Ver. 12.

ſalt the memorable Story of the lame Man, heal'd by *Peter* and *John*, ¶ we ſhall perceive they deriv'd their Power from Chriſt, and did it in his Name; *Ye Men of Iſrael, why marvel ye at this? or why look ye ſo earneſtly upon us, as though by our own Power or Holineſs we had made this Man walk?* His Name* (viz. *Chriſt's*) *through Faith in his Name, hath made this Man ſtrong, whom ye ſee and know; yea, the Faith, which is by him, hath given him this perfect Soundneſs in the Preſence of you all.* Our Lord had *Life in himſelf*, and was able by his own Power to do all the Father did; and the leaſt that can be infer'd from his *majeſtick* Godlike Style, and manner of acting in the whole Courſe of his Miniſtry, is, that he was inveſted with *all the Authority* and Soveraignty that the Father himſelf is inveſted with, and hath the ſame rightful Claim to Submiſſion, Homage, and Adoration with him; and ſurely ſuch *plenary* Authority can ſit well upon no Creature, but muſt imply that our Lord was the proper Son of God. This is exactly agreeable to what he told his Diſciples, that when the Spirit was pour'd out upon them, *they ſhould know him to be in his Father*, i. e. that he poſſeſs'd the ſame Nature and Power, and co-operated with him efficiently in all his Works: *And I will pray the Father, and he ſhall give you another Comforter,† even the Spirit of Truth; and at that Day ye ſhall know that I am in my Father.* And tho' it be ſaid in the following Words, *and you in me, and I in you*, this can never be meant *exactly* of ſuch an Union, as is between the Father and the Son, ſpoken of *ver.* 9, 10. but only ſomething *reſembling* it, in reſpect of Intimacy, as is clearly explain'd, *ver.* 23. *And my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our Abode with him*: And tho' our Lord ſays a little below, *ver.* 28. *My Father is greater than I*, it can make nothing againſt his Equality with him in all eſſential Perfections (as ſome pretend.) Had he ſaid, indeed, *God is greater* than I, then might there have been a little more Cauſe for their

¶ Acts iii. 12, 16. * Ver. 12. † John xiv. 16.

Triumphs from this Text; but when our Lord says only, *my Father is greater than I*, he must either speak, as some think, with respect to the relative, natural, and immutable *Order* of the Deity, where a Priority may be granted without any Inequality; or rather, as I conceive, as Mediator sent from the Father; in which respect he is consider'd something more than pure Deity, *viz.* a Person made up of God and Man; and consequently, in this Character, as being in a State of voluntary Subjection, he was inferior to the Father; which proves nothing against his Equality with the Father, *abstracted* from his humane Nature. That this is the genuine Meaning of the Place, there can be no doubt, if well and duly consider'd; for if our Lord intended by these Words to represent his Inferiority to the Father in his highest Character, there would have been nothing of Argument in them, nor no Agreement with the Context. He had told them not long before, that he and his Father were one; and in this Chapter he assures them, that they were so inseparably one, *that he that hath seen me hath seen the Father*; and for the Comfort of his disconsolate Disciples, whom he was now about to leave, he signifies to them, *that he was going to prepare a Place for them in his Father's House, where there are many Mansions*;* *that he would come again and receive them to himself, that where I am, there ye may be also* † To encourage them in this pleasing Belief, he intimates to them, ‡ that his Father was greater than he now *appear'd* to be, his Glory being *vail'd* in his Humanity, which they were too insensible of; ** but now he was going to his Father, with whom (as he had told them before) he was in reality one, tho' his Godhead was at present obscur'd; and therefore, says he, *if ye loved me, ye would rejoyce, because I said, I go unto my Father; for my Father is greater than*

* Ver. 2. † Ver. 3. ‡ Ver. 28. ** Ver. 7.

than I, i. e. *(now appear to be)* for there could have been *no Force in* this Reaſoning, had not our Lord been *one* with the Father; for why ſhould *they rejoyce, becauſe he was going to him*, unleſs it was that then it ſhould appear that he was *one with him* in Power and Glory? and as he had promiſed, *that where he was, there they ſhould be, he was able alſo to perform it.* I ſhould now paſs on to another Argument, having ſufficiently proved the *Jews* did not *pervert* our Lord's Meaning to an ill Senſe, but in truth, thought his calling God his own Father, did imply his making himſelf equal with him. But the Author having ſuggeſted in the Margin, that *in the 19th, and following Verſes, Chriſt directly aſſerts his Subordination and Dependence on the Father as the Son; and conſequently, denies that his Words did either in themſelves, or according to his Intention in ſpeaking of them, imply his Equality with, or Independence on him*; I ſhall examine into the true Scope of the ſeveral Verſes he alludes to; and the rather, becauſe I ſhall have a favourable Opportunity given me of *ſliding* the more eaſily into the Controverſy between me and the Author of *Unity*.

---

* Append. p. 36.

CHAP. V.

The divine Power and Godhead of our Lord Jesus Christ established from several Verses of the 5th of John; *and some of those Instances produc'd by the Author of* Unity, *to recommend to us his unscriptural Notion of* a supreme *and* subordinate *God, fairly considered, and prov'd to be not* parallel; *which undeniably renders his Attempt to reconcile the Unity of God with the Divinity of Christ vain and successless.*

AS the *Jews* would discern nothing in our Lord but his humane Nature, they were easily (thus blinded with Prejudice) led to charge him with breaking the *Sabbath*, for healing on that Day, and to form an Accusation of Blasphemy, because he said God was his Father, as has been already shewn: Our Lord therefore, in these following Verses, fully represents the State of the Case, *viz.* that he did not heal by any common and humane, but *divine Power* and *Virtue*, which lay conceal'd under that *visible* Garb he now appear'd in; and consequently, that he was not only Man, but God, and as such he had wrought so miraculous a Cure on the *Sabbath* Day, which was *sufficient* to justify him in so doing, and withal skreen him from the heavy Charge of Blasphemy for calling God his Father, seeing he did the same Works, which is a convincing Argument of his possessing the same Power and Godhead.

Ver. 19. *Then answered Jesus, and said unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, the Son can do nothing of himself, but what he sees the Father do; for what things soever he doth, these also doth the Son likewise.*

These

These Words are far from teaching us the Son's Inferiority to the Father, as is insinuated; but rather that he is actually one in Nature with him, seeing Father and Son are inseparable and undivided in their Operations; for 'tis evident to all, that our blessed Lord does not in this Verse *deny the Charge* of making himself *equal* to God, by telling them he did not think he was God, nor say it, nor mean any thing like it: No, instead of being solicitous to satisfy them to the contrary by any negative or softening Terms, in order to cool and asswage their heated Resentments, he here *only* explains and vindicates the Expression, and thereby *his Conduct* in healing on the Sabbath-Day, by shewing, that as he was the Son of God, he *necessarily possesses* the same Knowledge and Power; that he was also under an holy *Necessity* of doing *whatsoever* the Father doth, so that he can neither will, nor do any thing *without* him, much less in *Opposition* to him; because (as he is the same in Nature) he invariably acts as the Father acts, without any *Possibility* of doing otherwise: *For what things soever the Father doth, these also,* Τἀυτα, *the very same doth the Son likewise,* ὁμοίως, in the same manner, with the same Will and Power, without any Imperfection or Dependence; and consequently as the Works of the Son are one and the same as the Father's, if the Works of the Father are no Violation of the Sabbath, no more are the Works of the Son, and so he may with the utmost Right call God his Father.

Ver. 20. *For the Father loveth the Son, and sheweth him all things that himself doth; and he will shew greater Works than these, that ye may marvel*; q. d. As true Love and inviolable Friendship produces a *generous Communion* among Friends, so the Father opens all his Councils to the Son of his Delight, who being the *express Image of his Person*, has with him a Fulness of Knowledge and Power, and a perfect Draught of all his Designs; which, though he is become Man, and appears no otherwise in your

your Eye, he will punctually and exactly execute; and of which the miraculous Cures he has already performed are but a Prelude to those wondrous Works that shall *hereafter* be effected, enough to fill you with Amazement at his Glory and Power, and to convince you that *he is Lord of the Sabbath-Day also*; and which will be such undeniable Demonstrations of his Divinity, if not to *satisfy*, yet to astonish you, that you will not be able with any *Shadow* of Reason to gainsay it.

This we find verified in our Lord's raising *Lazarus* from the Dead; in healing the most stubborn and malignant Diseases with a Word, *saying, I will, be thou clean*, as God said, *Let there be Light, and there was Light*; in forgiving Sins, which made the *Jews* cry out, *Who can forgive Sins but God alone*? * And in many other Instances of sovereign Power; such — as abrogating the Ceremonial Law; instituting new Ordinances — enforcing the Precepts of Christianity upon the Sanction of Rewards and Punishments; his raising the Dead, and executing a final Judgment, *&c.* All which will in the Sequel appear bright Discoveries of his Power and Godhead.

Ver. 21. *For as the Father raiseth up the Dead, and quickeneth them, even so the Son quickeneth whom he will.*

This is no weak Proof of the Son's Equality to the Father, drawn from his essential Prerogative of acting with the *same Power* and *Liberty* as his Father, so that the Will and Actions of one are not to be separated from the other; but those Works which are peculiar to God to do at Pleasure, the Son of his Love can perform in the same manner; *q. d.* For as the Father under the Old Testament, whenever he thought fit to manifest his Almighty Power, restored the Dead to Life, so you shall see the Son exert the same Almighty Power at Will,

* Luke v. 21.

Will, either by himself or Apostles, whom he shall commission and empower to act in his Name, as the Father did *Elijah* and *Elisha*, or any other Prophet. This shews that our Lord does not act as the Father's Instrument, but by the same Power, because with the *same absolute Freedom of Will*; and though as Mediator he may be said to do every thing in Obedience to his Father's Will, yet he always works freely, and inseparably with the Father, being moved hereto by *an Excellence of Nature* that is the same in both, and that equally moves them to the same Acts of Power and Goodness; the Son therefore, in *Conjunction* with his Father, not exclusive of the Holy Ghost, is the *Principle* of all Life, both natural, spiritual and eternal. Now, seeing 'tis proper only to God to give or restore Life, as he is the sole Quickener of the Dead, † this Text may well be thought a flagrant Testimony of our Lord's Equality with the Father; for though the Prophets of Old both healed sick Persons, and rais'd the Dead to Life, yet not one of them did it either under the Notion that he was Son of God, or ascrib'd to himself a Power of raising the Dead equal to God, much less asserted, that they *quickened whom they would.*

Ver. 22. *For the Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son.*

This further demonstrates our Lord's Equality to the Father; for to him, as the Son of God, as well as the Son of Man, who alone is qualified for so stupendious an Office, as Governor and Lord of all things, belongs all Jurisdiction; he is the sovereign Disposer of Life and Death, invested with a plenary Power and Authority to exercise universal Sway over all, according to *Matth.* xxviii. 18. *all Power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth*; in the Father's thus committing *all Judgment* to our

† 1 Sam. ii. 6. Deut. xxxii. 39. Rom. iv. 17.

our bleſſed Lord, Dr. *Whitby* tells us, * " *Woltzogenius* " himſelf grants is comprehended *totum regimen, & di-* " *vinum totius mundi imperium*, an entire Government, " and divine Empire over the whole World, and eſpe- " cially over the whole Church of God." And I don't think 'tis a ſtrain'd Conſtruction; for Judgment, according to the *Hebrew* Idiom, is ſometimes taken for Rule or Empire. Thus, in *Judges* xvi. 31. שפט את ישראל, he judged *Iſrael*, that is, rul'd *Iſrael*: Now if the Son be Governor of the World, who ſuſtaineth all things by the Word of his Power, and by whom all things conſiſt, ſurely he is God equal to the Father, of one Nature, Will and Power; *for the Father judgeth no Man.* What then, hath he *reſigned* his Empire to his Son? This can't be ſuppoſed, unleſs we make God the Father like an indolent Epicurean Deity, that ſits in the Heavens *liſtleſs and unconcerned* about the Affairs of Mortals. But now if Chriſt be conſidered in his higheſt Character as one with the Father, the ſupreme King and Lord of Heaven and Earth, *God over all, bleſſed for ever*; this unties the Knot, and plainly ſhews, that the Father *alſo* doth govern the World, though not *alone*, yet *together* with his Son, who being one in Eſſence with him, and in Power, as he firſt created, ſo by his unerring Providence he ſteers it through all the Floatings of Time and Caſualty. And tho' under the Goſpel-Diſpenſation the Son is repreſented as having a *peculiar Kingdom of his own*, adminiſtred in his Name, and by Virtue of his ſovereign Authority, by which he governs this lower World, and diſpoſes of all things in Subſerviency to the Ends of his Mediation, it can't be thought that the Father has put the Power of governing the World out of his own Hands: For tho' all Power is given to Chriſt, the Mediator, yet the whole of it is ſtill *retain'd* by God; becauſe he who is Mediator *is God as well as Man*,

* Upon the Place.

Man, and essentially and inseparably one with the Father, and so acts by the *same* Energy, tho' under a *new* Character.

If any should contend, that this Text must be interpreted of *the last Judgment*, 'twill be equally strong for our Lord's Divinity; for this must suppose him to be most wise, omniscient, omnipresent, to know all Secrets, to search all Hearts, and to have the absolute Power of Life and Death, of Absolution and Condemnation; and that he saves and destroys, acquits or condemns, and executes the whole *irrepealable* Sentence in Conjunction with the Father. We are told, indeed, *the Father judgeth no Man* (*i. e.* God under the Character of Father, or first Person of the Trinity as such;) for *as he is God* by the Confession of all, he can't be conceiv'd a *bare Spectator* of the Work, seeing God is frequently in Scripture declar'd to be *the Judge of the World*; and yet the Apostle tells us, *we shall all stand before the Judgment Seat of Christ*; but this he immediately explains consistent enough; *so then every one of us shall give an account of himself to God*;* which shews that Christ, the *Judge of Quick and Dead*, is God, or Jehovah (as appears by the Citation) which being the peculiar Name of the most High, who is only one Being, *God himself is Judge*,† and not an *inferior* Agent, or Representative, who only bears his Authority, and is not possess'd of his Nature and Perfections. If this was duly considered, 'twould necessarily convince us of the *Vanity* of any Attempt whatever to reconcile the Unity of God with the Divinity of Christ, by making the Father the Supreme, and the Son a separate subordinate Being; and how the Author of *Unity* has succeeded in it, will be seen presently.

He observes, § *That the Doctrine of the Unity of God has afforded the most plausible Objections against Dr.* Clark's *Doctrine of the Trinity.*——I'll venture to add, the Unity

* Rom. xiv. 10, 12. † Exod. iii. 15. Deut. vi. 4. § Unity, p. 16.

bity of God has afforded not only *plausible*, but *unanswerable* Objections against his whole Scheme; for according to his Notion, if the Term *God* signifies one having Dominion (which is the specious *Salvo* to evade the Force of those Scriptures where Christ is expressly call'd God) there must be a supreme and subordinate God, *i. e. two Gods*: Or if it be reply'd, that there can't be two Gods, unless *both* are suppos'd *supreme*; then our Saviour is no God, contrary to several *express* Texts of Scripture. Here is an insuperable Difficulty; if there be two Gods, how is Unity maintain'd? Or if *Supremacy* goes into the *true* Notion of God, and the Son is *not* supreme, he is no God: Let this be sifted into, and turn'd over and over, 'twill be found an invincible Objection. And this Dr. *Waterland* had urg'd to great Advantage; but the Author notwithstanding pushes on for a supreme and *subordinate* Sense of the Word God; and to this End offers several Scripture Instances to illustrate the famous Distinction, which, according to his own Scheme of Thoughts, he takes to be entirely parallel; but if they should prove *quite different* Cases, I hope he will honestly give them up, as not pat to his Design. I think it needless to consider all the Instances he has produc'd, which (besides swelling this Treatise to a bigger Length than is expedient) would answer *no valuable* Purpose; for seeing they are all of the same Sort, if one or two fails, the rest must *equally* droop. I shall therefore only pitch on two of the most considerable, and which the Author seems to lay great Stress upon.

1*st*. The first I shall consider, is that memorable *Case of* Pharaoh's *being Ruler of* Egypt, *and* Joseph *at the same time Ruler of* Egypt, † which the Author thinks a full Illustration of the Case. *I intreat the Reader (says he) to take particular*

† *Unity*, p. 23.

cular Notice of this Inſtance, and to remember that Pharaoh *and* Joſeph *were both of the ſame humane Nature, and equal as Men; and that all the Subjects of* Pharaoh *were the Subjects of* Joſeph; *According to thy Word ſhall all my People be ruled; and yet they were not two independent Rulers, nor one Ruler; but* Pharaoh *was the one and only Ruler, and* Joſeph *his Deputy.* In this Inſtance *Pharaoh* is ſuppos'd to repreſent the *Father*, the ſupreme Ruler, and *Joſeph*, the *Son*, the *Father's* Depu y. But this can by no Means be *a parallel* Caſe; for 'tis evident that *Pharaoh* was under a Neceſſity, conſidering the *dark Cloud* that hung over his Kingdom, a devouring Famine coming on, and, perhaps, other weighty Reaſons of State concurring, to conſtitute *ſo wiſe* a Man as *Joſeph* to rule under him; he being himſelf unequal to the Task, or not willing to undergo *all the Toils* of Government; and *Joſeph*, being furniſh'd with ſuitable Qualifications, was fit for ſo high a Station, and had in all reſpects *a Capacity* for ſo big an Employ. But God being infinite in Wiſdom, Power, and every Perfection, was under *no manner of Neceſſity* to conſtitute one under him to govern the World, who could do all things without Labour or Inconvenience. Beſides, we can't imagine that God ſhould *wholly reſign* the Affairs of his Empire to his Son, as *Pharaoh* did to *Joſeph*, who gave up all the Reins of Government to him, contented *only* with the Throne, with the bare Preheminence, Title, and Honour of King, whilſt he exercis'd little or nothing of the Office, but left all to *Joſeph*'s Conduct. Shou'd we ſuppoſe any thing like this of God the Father, we ſhou'd entertain *the moſt depretiating* and injurious Thoughts of his Majeſty, as if the greateſt and beſt of Beings took no Care of his Creatures, nor meddled with the Government of this lower World, as if he had committed all to the Management of a *Vicegerent*, his Son; which is contrary to the very Notion the Scriptures give us of God, as a Being *that preſerves Man and Beaſt, whoſe Eye is over all his Works, and who even watches all our Paths*, &c.

and

and at the same time must afford but *gloomy Thoughts* to those who deny the Divinity of the Son. Then as to the second Case there is no Parallel: *Joseph* was qualify'd with *sufficient* Wisdom and Prudence to manage the important Concerns he was entrusted with; but if our Lord be consider'd not as the supreme God, but *a Creature*, he must be incapable of governing the World, and so of acting under the supreme God in that glorious and *supereminent* Station, which *requires infinite Wisdom and infinite Power* to discharge; and which therefore God challenges as his incommunicable Property, and special Work; *for the Kingdom is the Lord's, and he is Governour among the Nations, a great God, and a great King above all Gods.* § Now can it ever be imagin'd that God shou'd communicate infinite Perfections to a *finite Nature*, without the Absurdity of making *an infinite Creature*, and another Lord the *supreme* Governour among the Nations? which is such a Contradiction, that if the learned Patrons of Reason can digest, they have *little Cause* to complain of Obscurity or Contradiction in the Doctrine of the Trinity; for 'tis shocking to all the Maxims of Reason, as well as Scripture, to suppose that infinite Powers shou'd reside in Christ, a finite *limited* Being, and be *possessed* by him, and *exerted at Pleasure*, or by any other Person that is not strictly absolutely infinite, and God over all. The very Supposal of this implies many palpable Contradictions, *viz.* that a Being of infinite Perfections may be a Creature, that this Being is not one, and consequently that there may be *as many constituted Gods* of infinite Perfections, as there are Angels or Men, and the like Absurdities. So that the Case between *Pharaoh* and *Joseph*, the one a *supreme*, and the other a *subordinate* Ruler, can't be in any respect parallel to the feign'd Distinction of a supreme and subordinate God.

One

§ *Psal.* xxii. 28. cxxxv. 3.

One thing I had almoſt forgot to remark, the Author ſays, *that all the Subjects of* Pharaoh *were the Subjects of* Joſeph. * But can any one dream in a like Caſe, that the People of *Ireland* are the *Subjects* of the Lord Lieutenant? According to the uſe of all Language, and the very Reaſon of the thing, they can only and properly be call'd the Subjects of the King of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*; ſo *Pharaoh*'s Subjects were not the Subjects of *Joſeph*, *for*, *according to thy Word ſhall all my People be ruled*, (ſays *Pharaoh* to him) *and not thy People*; † they ſtill retain'd their Relation to *Pharaoh only* as their King, which was not the leaſt chang'd by his ſetting *Joſeph* as a Deputy Ruler over them. But tho' *Pharaoh*'s Subjects were not *Joſeph*'s Subjects, the Subjects of God are the Subjects of Chriſt, not upon Account of his being a ſubordinate Ruler, which can't poſſibly hold good, but becauſe the Laws, by which they are govern'd, flow from *his own Authority*, as well as the Father's: And this is the peculiar and diſtinguiſhing Mark of Sovereignty, as the Biſhop of *Bangor* has fully demonſtrated. § Submiſſion then is equally due to Father and Son, becauſe they reign abſolutely and inſeparably together, and their Power as well as Nature is undivided; for tho' the Son is appointed ſupreme Ruler to carry on the Deſigns of redeeming Grace, God the Father has not given away *his natural Right* of Government, nor has the Son *loſt his*, by aſſuming *a new* Character of Mediator, and becoming Man; but he ſtill rules as God, *one in Eſſence* with his Father, from whence comes all Power and Authority, which he exerciſes as Lord Redeemer, and all thoſe Bleſſings which he diſpences to his Subjects; and therefore 'tis very remarkable, that in the Language of the New Teſtament Chriſt is call'd the *one Lord*, which cer-

G tainly

* Unity, p. 23. † *Gen.* xli. 39. 40. § See Anſwer to the Committee, pag. 12.

tainly does not exclude God the Father from being, with the Son and Holy Ghoſt, *Lord of Lords, and King of Kings.*

The other Inſtance I ſhall fix on, to ſhew the Author's Diſtinction of a ſupreme and ſubordinate God has no parallel Caſe in Scripture, which will help us to ſo uncommon and artificial a Gloſs, is in Page 26.

God created all things, Gen. i. 1. *Chriſt created all things*, Joh. i. 3. This he tells us *St.* Paul *reconciles, as I have done all of the like Nature, by ſaying*, Epheſ. iii. 9, *God who created all things by Jeſus Chriſt, that is, God is the primary Creator, and Chriſt is his Inſtrument in Creation, or God gave him an Ability and a Command to create the World.* To repreſent the Weakneſs of this Way of Reaſoning, I ſhall ſhew,

1*ſt.* That Creation is appropriated to the one ſupreme Being, as his *own* handy Work, and is competible to none beſides.

2*dly.* That our Lord Jeſus Chriſt had a *joint Efficiency* in Creation with the Father, and ſo was not an inſtrumental Cauſe.

3*dly.* That, admitting the Author's Explication, the Arguments from the Creation of the World, *to prove the Being of a God*, will be of no force.

1*ſt.* I ſhall ſhew, that Creation is appropriated to the one ſupreme Being as his *own* handy Work, and is competible to none beſides.

In what a *majeſtick* Manner do the Scriptures diſplay the Power of God, in giving Being to all things! And how ſtrong and peculiar are the Deſcriptions they give us of the great Creator as the only God! *O Lord God of* Iſrael, *which dwelleſt between the Cherubims, thou art the God, even thou alone, of all the Kingdoms of the Earth — All the Gods of the Nations are Idols, but the Lord made the Heavens.** He is infinitely ſuperior to all others, and none but he who is

* 2 Kings xix. 15. Pſal. xcvi. 5.

is the great King above all Gods, exclusive of all Instruments, made the World, and therefore he claims the Honour and Glory of so amazing a *Prodigy* of Power to himself. *I am the Lord that maketh all things, that stretcheth forth the Heavens alone, that spreadeth abroad the Earth by my self.* † But how can he be said to *do it alone*, and by himself, if he employ'd another *separate Agent* to do it for him? But to convince us there was no delegated, instrumental Power concerned, he assures us, *I, even my Hands have stretch'd out the Heavens*; § so that the Scriptures plainly ascribe Creation to God alone; and even Reason itself may teach us, that he *could* have no Deputy; for either this Agent was infinite or finite; not infinite, for whoever is so, is the first Cause, the one supreme Being, (which is giving up all); nor was he finite, for a finite Agent cannot receive Power to produce so vast an Effect, as *pure, naked Nothing* into Being, which exceeds all created, limited Capacities. This is so inconceivable an Instance of Power, that the *Aristotelian* Philosophers could by no means digest it; and therefore upon that Principle of their Masters, *Ex nihilo nihil fit*, Of nothing nothing is made, which is only true concerning natural Productions, they falsly argued, that the World must be eternal, because they could not *account* how all things should be produced out of Nothing: But as our shallow Understandings cannot comprehend the utmost *Extent* of Omnipotency, 'tis irrational to deny, what, if not granted, may be reduced to most palpable Absurdities. This however may convince us, that Creation is so stupendious a Work, that it can be attributed to none, but to one, supreme, infinite, first Cause; for so far *Aristotle*'s Maxim must hold, that Nothing can be made out of Nothing by any *created, finite* Instrument; for a greater *Distance* cannot

† Isa. xliv. 24. § Isai. xlv. 12.

be conceived than that, which is between Nothing and Something; and a greater *Power* there *cannot* be than that, which causes Nothing to pass into Being. Such a Power then can be exerted by none but the Almighty, the one uncreated, eternal, *boundless* Being; and as this gives us a noble and exalted Idea of unlimited Greatness, the Scriptures assure us, 'tis the Work of God alone; the *distinguishing* Character of his glorious and peerless Majesty to be Creator of all; *for he that built all things is God*; and to suppose the contrary would lead us into inextricable Labyrinths, as shall be demonstrated presently.

2*dly*. Our blessed Lord had a joint Efficiency in Creation with the Father, and so was not an instrumental, but a real efficient Cause.

All things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made. * All Creatures, without Exception, Angels as well as Men, the lofty *Cherubims*, as well as groveling Worms; and consequently he himself is not a Creature, because 'tis impossible that any thing should *make* it self: He must then be no less than the eternal God, one in Nature, Power, and Operation, *&c.* with his Father, jointly concerned in the *admirable Structure* of the Universe, not as another distinct, separate Creator, as *Co-assistent*, but as one Almighty Creator; so that all the Creatures of the Father are likewise the Creatures of the Son; their Original must be assign'd to both, as the one individual Author and Fountain of their Being. And nothing is clearer in Scripture than that God the Son is properly Creator of all things, as well as the Father; *For by him were all things created that are in Heaven, and that are in Earth, visible and invisible, whether they be Thrones, or Dominions, or Principalities, or Powers, all things were created by him, and for him.* † So that he is the

* Joh. i. 3. † Col. i. 15, 16, 17.

the *final* as well as *efficient* Cauſe, they are made for his Service and Glory, which is the ultimate End of their Creation: And ſurely all this cannot be ſaid of Chriſt as an Inſtrument barely in the Work; for though a Deputy ſhould call what he does, by Virtue of the Power veſted in him, his own proper Act; ſhould we further allow, that he may even aſſume the *Name* and *Title* of his Principal; yet to ſay, that his great and primary End is to act for himſelf, and his own Glory, is to give us ſuch an Idea of his Conduct, as at once deſtroys both his Relation, and his Fidelity: So that if Chriſt was not the ſupreme God, how could all things be made, not only by him, but for him? To which, if we add, that as at firſt he gave them their Exiſtence, ſo he *ſupports, upholds*, and *continues* them in it, 'twill be a preſſing Argument for his ſovereign Power and Godhead, *for by him all things conſiſt*; he is the Preſerver of all thoſe numberleſs Ranks of Creatures, which are in the viſible and inviſible World; and what more ſolid Evidence can there be of his acting jointly with the Father, both in the Works of *Creation* and *Providence*, than this? And leaſt it ſhould be thought that he acts by a *borrow'd* Power, as an under Agent, 'tis expreſly ſaid, he upholds all things by the Word of *his* Power, * not of his *Father*'s Power. This, indeed, ſhews a Diſtinction of Perſons, but cannot denote a ſeparate Power, for their Operations are as *undivided* as their Nature: *Hence whatſoever things the Father doth, theſe alſo doth the Son likewiſe.* † And tho' 'tis ſaid the World was made by him, δι' αὐτοῦ; this can be no Note of Inferiority, as if he was only the Father's Deputy in the Work; for this very Phraſe is apply'd to the Father himſelf, to ſhew his *Agency* herein, which is allowed by our Adverſaries to be abſolute and ſupreme; ¶ ſo that all Pretences from the Præpoſition,

* Heb. i. 3. † Joh. v. 19. ¶ Heb. ii. 10.

sition, Διά, signifying an Instrument, must be given up as trivial. And if it should be urg'd, that, when applied to the Father, it has not the same import as when applied to the Son, this is mere begging of the Question without any specious Shew of Reason; and therefore to cut off any such poor Plea, and to demonstrate there is no manner of Argument to be drawn from the Force of the Præposition *by*, to denote Instrumentality, I refer the impartial Reader to Places in the Margin,* where the Word Διά is used to signify the principal Cause, and to *Heb.* i. 8, 9, 10, where there is express mention made of the Son's creating all things *absolutely*, without any Præposition at all. *But to the Son he saith, thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever — And thou, Lord, in the Beginning hast laid the Foundations of the Earth, and the Heavens are the Works of thine Hands.* This is cited by the sacred Writer from *Psalm* cii. 25, 26, 27, where the great *Jehovah* is spoken of as the Creator of all things; which being here so *directly* applied to our blessed Lord, 'tis a most cogent and lively Proof, that he created the World by his own proper Energy and Power, as one with the Father; so that the Passage cited by our Author, *Ephes.* iii. 9. *God who created all things by Jesus Christ*, cannot intend, that Christ was only an *Instrument* in the Creation, as the Author fancies, but only the Order of Working, *viz.* to shew, that the *Co-operation* of the Son with the Father therein was according to their *manner of subsisting* in the Godhead, the Father first, and the Son second in order. All things then are made by the Son in Conjunction with the Father, and the Father hath made nothing but in and by the Son; so that the Operation of both is of equal Extent, and they are but *one* Creator. Whence it appears, that the Præposition *by*, does not necessarily infer an Instrument in the Work;

* Rom. xi. 31, 36. 1 Cor. xi. 19. —— xii. 8, 9. 2 Cor. i. 1. Gal. i. 1. 1 Thess. iv. 2. 2 Thess. iii. 12.

Work; which is abundantly evident from *Isai.* xliv. 24, cited above, *I am the Lord, that spreadeth abroad the Earth by myself*, where every one must see there is as much Reason to interpret the Phrase, *by myself*, of an Instrument, as there is this Phrase, *by Jesus Christ*; but neither of them can be so construed without manifest Absurdities; and, indeed, what the Author means by Instrument is scarce intelligible. If he takes the Word in the Sense 'tis generally used, it must imply an Impossibility, *viz.* that an Instrument should be employed in Creation, where there was *nothing* to work upon; no *præ-existent* Matter to shape and mould up. But his explanatory Clause, *or God gave him an Ability, and a Command to create the World*, seems to aim at an inferior Agent, distinct and separate from God, *capacitated* for the Work, whom he calls an Instrument. This however is equally clog'd with Difficulties. For,

First. If Christ was such an Instrument in the Creation, he must be either *created* for this purpose, or *uncreated.* If created, 'tis contrary to the express Revelation, *that all things were made by him*, since he himself could not be made by himself. If uncreated, he was God from Eternity, and so acted by an *Original* Almighty Power, and not as an inferior Deputy. But further, supposing that our Lord was a *different Spirit* from the Father, as our Author contends, and his *Instrument* in the Creation, it follows,

Secondly, That God first made him, *in order* to make all other Creatures, which looks as if he thought his own Will and *Fiat insufficient* (at least, not meet) to strike the World into Being, contrary to *Psalms* xxxiii. 9. *He spoke and it was done, he commanded and it stood fast:* Besides, if Christ begun to be, and there was the least *Point* of Duration when he was not, he must be created immediately, by the Power of God, out of nothing; and why should it be thought, that God should not as well create all things without an Instrument, as create

that Inſtrument without an Inſtrument, the ſame Power being *requiſite* to create one as the other? But the Scripture knows no ſuch thing as an inſtrumental Creator; the efficacious Command of God gave Original to all things, and nothing was neceſſary to God's bringing forth a World out of nothing, but the ſimple Act of his Will, which is both the principal, and, if proper to ſay any, the inſtrumental Cauſe, ſeeing *by his own Power and outſtretched Arm he made the Heavens and the Earth*;* 'twas form'd by a Word, and eſtabliſh'd by a Command, without the leaſt Labour or Toil, which muſt exclude all Under-Agents.

Thirdly, It follows, that this *deputed* Creator, tho' a finite temporary Being, had an Ability to produce all things out of nothing, which is the *ſure Characteriſtick* and Mark of eternal Power and Godhead;† and ſo he, who is but a Creature, or *not the ſupreme* God, according to the Confeſſion of our Adverſaries, is, by the *Deſcription* of Scripture, the ſupreme Being, which is a Contradiction. Or,

Fourthly, As no created Being is by Nature and *Neceſſity* God, he cannot be the Creator of the World, according to theſe and other Texts of Scripture; ſo that this infinite and almighty Power, by which all things are created, no Creature can *be inveſted* with; and conſequently, Chriſt Jeſus, if only a Creature, is *not Creator* of the World, contrary to many plain and *direct* Teſtimonies of ſacred Writ. Or,

Fifthly, If Chriſt was made, in order that we might be created, he was made *for us*, contrary to *Col.* i. 17. where 'tis ſaid, *all things were created by him, and for him:*** So that if there is any Juſtice and *Beauty* in the Apoſtle's Argument, to ſhew the Preheminence and Dignity of the Male Sex, Mankind muſt be thought of *greater Excellency*

---

* Jer. x. 12. xxxii. 17. † Jer. x. 10. 11. *compar'd with* Rom. ii. 22.
** 1 Cor. xi. 9.

cellency than the Son of God's Love; and what debasing and low Sentiments might we then entertain of him? 'Tis no Wonder, according to this, to hear some (otherwise Men of a fair Character) who stick not in common Conversation to say, *God might, if he had pleas'd, made you or I Redeemer of the World*, &c. A shuddering Thought! is there any Comparison between him who is the eternal Son of God, the Brightness of his Glory, and feeble dying Mortals of a *Yesterday*'s Date, who in thus *professing themselves to be wise*, to dictate what God might do, 'tis to be fear'd act far *below* the Character. But,

Sixthly, If the Father *gave Christ an Ability and a Command to create the World*, he was only himself an *unactive* Spectator, and had no immediate Hand in it, but left all to the Contrivance and Conduct of his Under-Agent, contrary to *Jer.* x. 12. *He hath made the Heavens by his Power, he hath established the World by his Wisdom, and hath stretched out the Heavens by his Discretion.*

Seventhly, If the Father is Creator, and the Son Creator, supposing those Places are to be literally understood of a *proper* Creation, where Christ is said *to make all things*, then our Adversaries necessarily introduce *two Creators*, contrary to *Mal.* ii. 10. *Hath not one God created us?*

Eighthly, It will follow, that we may give to another the Glory of God's Name and Works; but the Heavens only declare the Glory of God, and shew *his handy Work*, and not that of an inferior Agent; for the Lord hath reserved the sole Glory, of so great a Work as Creation, to himself alone; therefore says the holy *Psalmist*, viii. 3. *When I consider the Heavens, the Work of thy Fingers, the Moon and the Stars which thou hast ordain'd, what is Man that thou art mindful of him? O Lord, our Lord, how excellent is thy Name in all the Earth*, &c.

These, and many more, are the unavoidable Consequences of an instrumental Creator; but the *Scripture Account* will appear easy and obvious, if we consider the Son of the same Nature and Substance with the Father,

so

ſo inſeparably united, that *nothing* can be the Work of one, without being at the ſame time the Work of the other, as our Lord himſelf tells us; *my Father worketh hitherto, and I work.* This, I ſay, will be a Solution to all the Difficulties that may be ſtarted againſt the Creation of the World by the Son, and yet retaining one Creator, he being one with his Father, far more natural and conſiſtent with Scripture and Reaſon, than what the Author has offered. For,

Thirdly, Admitting his Explication, the Argument from the Creation of the World, to prove the Being of a God, will be of no force; how then may Atheiſts triumph, and Infidelity and Prophaneneſs go thro' our Streets at *Noon-day* unmaſk'd and undiſguis'd, inſtead of lurking, as it now does, in the vileſt *Clubs* of Darkneſs?

If we ſuppoſe with the Atheiſt, or *wiſh* with the Libertine, ſo far as *ſupinely* to give into the Notion, that there is no God, 'twill be impoſſible to give any tolerable Account of the *Exiſtence* of the World; for nothing is more evident, than that this vaſt and beautiful Syſtem was either from Eternity, or elſe that it had a Beginning; and if it had a Beginning, this muſt be aſcribed merely to Chance, to a Concourſe of Atoms (a Thought as *wild* as the Space they are ſuppos'd ever to rove in, before they luckily hit the World into Form and Shape) or elſe it muſt be owing to the *Operation* of ſome wiſe and almighty Agent: It might be demonſtrated from the cleareſt Principles of Reaſon, that the World had a Beginning. But this is not the Diſpute: Whatever then had a Beginning, muſt have an *efficient* Cauſe; it could not make itſelf; for that would be to give it a Power before it was, and to ſuppoſe it to be and not to be at the ſame time; hence it muſt follow, that ſome more excellent Being made this World, whom we call the *one* living and true God; for if more concurr'd to the making of the World than one infinite Being, they were

were either total or partial Causes of its Existence. To be *total* efficient Causes of one and the same Effect, is a Contradiction; for if the World was *wholly* created by one supreme Being, nothing of it could be created by *another*: If only *partial* Causes, there may be *many* who did concur towards the Creation, and how many 'twill be impossible to judge; for when once we acknowledge more than one that had any Hand in Creation, their Numbers can't be assign'd, we may run into all the Heresies of the *Gnosticks*, *Menandrians*, *Saturnilians*, *Basilidians*, *Carpocratians*, *Valentinians*, and others, who all combin'd to degrade the Almighty, and take away from him the Glory of this first *Manifestation* of his Power and Godhead, in creating and framing the Fabrick of the Universe, by attributing it to *Angels*, their feign'd *Æones*, and what not; but the Scriptures are plain, that there is but one Creator, the true eternal God. Christ is Creator, the Creator is true and eternal God; therefore Christ is true and eternal God; *he made the World*, and acted herein by the same Power, Wisdom, and Will, as the Father; for tho' another Person in the Godhead, these Attributes of Power and Wisdom, *&c.* which he exerted in Creation, spring from the one undivided Essence; so that the *Cause* of the World's Existence is not many, but one, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the one living and true God. But should we assert that Christ, as an *inferior* and separate Being from the Father, made the World as his *Deputy* and Instrument, we subvert all the Arguments urg'd with the utmost Strength and Advantage, to prove the Being of a God from the Formation, Beauty, and Design of it, which would then appear weak and inconclusive; for if a mere Creature, or one who is not the supreme God, could do such *stupendious* things by a borrow'd Ability, how do I know, may any one object (that denies the Authority of the Scriptures) that he was commission'd to do it by a superior Power, or that this superior Power was not *delegated* by another,

another, and so on *in Infinitum*? by which all our Knowledge of God's Being, Powers, and Perfections, which is deduc'd from the Wonders of Creation, is at once lost; for how can it possibly be offer'd, as an Argument from the Creation of the World, to prove the Existence of one infinite, supreme, first Cause, if one, that was not so, could, and *actually* did, make the World? and at this rate, how absurdly must the Apostle argue? how unjustly must he accuse the Heathen World for their wretched Dulness and Stupidity, in not attending to the irrefragable Proofs of a Deity, from the things that were made, and so *glorify* him accordingly? *For the invisible things of him* (says he) *from the Creation of the World are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal Power and Godhead; so that they are without Excuse; because that when they knew God, they glorify'd him not as God, neither were thankful, but became vain in their Imaginations, and their foolish Heart was darkned. Professing themselves to be wise, they became Fools.** Upon the whole, if Creation is the *peculiar* Work of the one true God, and a *Demonstration* of his being, when Christ is said to create the World, it cannot be as a *subordinate Agent*, separate from his Father, but as one that has the same Power and Perfections, *&c.* and consequently, the Author's Explication of a supreme and inferior Creator must be prodigiously squeez'd, unnatural, and unscriptural; and so can be no parallel Case to illustrate the *blazing* Invention of a supreme and subordinate God; and his Method of reconciling the Unity of God with the Divinity of Christ must appear, after all, trifling and abortive. The *Socinians* long ago rejected this Scheme as inconsistent and monstrous; and therefore, by a surprizing Turn of Language, and some peculiar Reaches of Criticism, they had a knack of wresting all those

* Rom. i. 20. *&c.*

thoſe Texts, that ſpeak of Chriſt's creating the *World*, to a *metaphorical* Creation, which is doubtleſs a torturing of the inſpired Writings, but more favourable to common Senſe, and leſs clog'd with Difficulties, than the very fine Advances of our Author and his Collegues.

CHAP. VI.

An Enquiry concerning the Object of the Chriſtians Worſhip; wherein the Unreaſonableneſs of degrading the Son of God, who, according to John v. 23. * *is* to be honoured even as the Father, *will appear conſpicuous; and the aſſigning ſuch* Degrees *of divine Worſhip, as will admit of the Diſtinction of ſupreme and ſubordinate, trifling and unſcriptural, ſeeing the one* ultimate *Object of it is Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, excluſive of all others.*

Ver. 23. *THAT all Men ſhould honour the Son, even as they do the Father. He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father.*

This is a pregnant Demonſtration of our Lord's Equality, as Son of God, with his eternal Father, both in Nature, Dignity, and Glory; for to whom *equal* Honour and Worſhip is due in all reſpects, they muſt be of equal Dignity, *&c.* So that if the Son was not God by Nature, there would neceſſarily be ſome peculiar and diſtinguiſhing *Mark* of Honour due to the Father, and *commanded* to be paid to him, which was not due to the Son;

---

* Among the Verſes referr'd to by the *Appendix*, and will therefore be conſider'd as the Foundation of the following Chapter.

Son; but there is none; for all Men are under equal Obligations by this very Text, to *honour the Son even as the Father*, καθὼς, in like manner, *i. e.* with the *same* divine Homage, sacred Adoration, and religious Obedience; and however some have attempted to *wring* this Passage to a low Meaning, suitable to their low and prejudic'd Thoughts of the Saviour of the World, who not only ransom'd us from temporal Thraldom, but eternal Misery, no other Interpretation, than I have given, can be consistent with the Context, and the whole Strain of Scripture; for are we bound to call upon God the Father, as one that alone can hear and answer our religious Prayers? so we must call upon *the Name of Jesus Christ his Son*,* *our Lord.* Are we to adore and bow down prostrate before God the Father? the same Expression of Submission and Allegiance is due to God the Son, by the whole rational Creation, by the highest *Order* of Creatures.† Are the most *lofty* Ascriptions of divine Honour, Glory, and Praise, paid to God the Father? they are also paid to God the Son.‡ Are we oblig'd to make the Father the *Object* of our Faith, Hope, Joys, and religious Trust? so we are requir'd to make the Son.‖ Are we commanded to love God above all, with all our Hearts, Mind, and Strength? so must we love our dear Lord Jesus *more than Father or Mother, Brother or Sister, House or Lands; yea, than Life itself;*§ *and if any Man love him not* (sincerely and with the highest Affection) *let him be*, says the Apostle, *an Anathema Maranatha*; for he is our *Life*, our *Hope*, our *Peace*, our *All.*¶ Are we requir'd to make an absolute *Resignation* of our Understandings and Wills to the Authority of God? so must we be *subject* to Christ, our very Thoughts must be

---

* Acts ix. 14. 2 Cor. xii. 7, 8. 1 Cor. i. 2. † Rev. iv. 10, 11.
‡ 2 Pet. iii. 18. Rev. v. 12. ‖ John iii. 36. xiv. 1. Phil. vii. 13. Psal. ii. 1, 2. § Matth. x. 37. ¶ Col. iii. 4. 1 Tim. i. 2. Eph. ii. 14. Col. iii. 11.

be *brought into Captivity to the Obedience of Chriſt*, we muſt take his *Yoke* upon us, and do his *whole* acceptable Will.** *Finally*, are we to live unto God as our ultimate End? ſo we muſt *live unto Chriſt, who died for us and roſe again*; the Advancement of his Glory and Intereſt ſhould be our principal Aim and Deſign, *for to me to live*, ſays the great Apoſtle, *is Chriſt, and to die is Gain.* †† I do but hint theſe things, becauſe they may be probably more largely handled in other Places. One thing I can't paſs by unobſerv'd, and that is, that our bleſſed Saviour is, in a particular Manner, the ultimate Object of our Worſhip in the Lord's Supper, the chief Deſign of that *holy* Inſtitution being to honour him diſtinctly, by a grateful Commemoration of his dying Love, by the Exerciſe of a lively Faith on him, by a renewed Dedication of ourſelves to him, *as the Lord our Redeemer*, publickly aſcribing Glory, Dominion, and Praiſe to him, as one God with the Father; and it ought to be remembred, that in all Ages of Chriſtianity, the Celebration of this Feaſt of Love has been reckon'd the moſt *ſolemn Part* of divine and publick Worſhip, and not unjuſtly; for here we adore the Love of God for the Gift of his Son; here our Faith, Love, Hope, Joy, and every Grace, is drawn forth; here we have *Communion* with the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, rejoyce in the Smiles of a reconciled Father, profeſs our Homage and Allegiance to the Lord Jeſus, *as ſupreme Lord and Lawgiver*, and without Limitation, ſecret Reſerves, or *Diſtinction* of Worſhip into Supreme and Subordinate, we ultimately devote ourſelves to his Glory and Service. But ſhould we disbelieve his Godhead, what *Errand* could we have at his Table, unleſs it was to *tread his Blood under foot*? What Adoration could we there pay him? and how could we venture to commit ourſelves, and our All, for

** 2 Cor. x. 5. Matth. xi. 29. Col. iii. 24. †† 2 Cor. v. 15. Phil. i. 21.

for Time and Eternity, into his Hands? how could we say with the Apostle, *I know in whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him against that Day*?* If Christ be not God, the ultimate Object of Worship with the Father, how *strangely* hath ours been misplac'd? alas, we have given away that Glory to one, which is *due* to the great Jehovah alone; the *Arians*, who have concealed themselves in our Assemblies, have prepostorously joyn'd with Idolaters, and so partook of the Sin: † But methinks the gracious and faithful God, who promis'd to lead his Churches into all necessary Truth, would never have suffer'd them, in all Ages, to err so grossly, so *dishonourable* to himself, and so *dangerous* to his People, in their Faith and Practice, as to the Saviour. But admitting this Argument is not so strong and cogent a Proof of our Lord's Divinity, as some would have it, can it be imagin'd that this Ordinance should be so much *own'd* and bless'd, to the *Comfort* of the Saints, who there pay their Lord supreme Homage, if he was not by Nature God? It must, indeed, be confess'd with *blushing*, that it has been an Institution vilely prostituted by the *British Protestant* Nation, to serve the lowest Purposes; and *worldly Motives*, it may be fear'd, have drag'd on Thousands unprepar'd to the sacred Solemnity, that otherwise had no *Heart* to come, a Sin of a lowring Aspect, which concurs, with our *Oaths*, Luxury, and Oppression, to fill up the Measure of our Iniquity: But however this be, I would appeal to the Faithful of all Denominations among us, hath not God often vouchsafed his *Presence* with you in this Ordinance? han't you enjoy'd *much* of Heaven and *spiritual* Pleasure, and even spy'd his Goodness passing before you? han't your Souls melted at his Love, and your

* 2 Tim. i. 12. † This Thought I find pursu'd with admirable Strength by Sir *Richard Blackmore*, in his just Prejudices against the *Arian* Hypothesis, to which I refer the Reader.

your Hearts been fir'd with noble *Æmulations*, to please and glorify the Redeemer God all your Days? and can it be ever thought the good Lord would have given such *feeling* and internal Evidences of *Christ*'s Divinity? that the Almighty, who is so *jealous* of his Honour, would afford his own gracious Presence and Blessing to the Churches in the very *Act* of Idolatry? Who can be so stupid or so hardy as to suppose God would thus encourage his Churches, to *supplant* the Honour of his own Name? so that nothing should unhinge our Faith of this, that our Lord is to be worshiped as the Father. So strong is the Force of this Truth, so prevailing, that Dr. *Clark*, in his Paraphrase, is fairly led to acknowledge it: "All which things plainly shew, that it is the Mind "and Will of God the Father, that the Son should be "honour'd with the *same* Faith and Obedience, which "he requires to be paid to himself." If the Doctor cordially approves of this Comment, as his known Ingenuity can't make us suspect, till he retracts it; because, tho' another's, he has recommended it to the World without any *Sign* of Dislike, for the *Instruction*, and not the *Deception* of those for whom his *familiar* and *easy* Exposition is adapted; all the Difficulty will be in the mean while to accommodate his *Scheme* to it; for if the *same* Faith and Obedience is due to the *Son* as the *Father*, they must necessarily be one, not only in Will and Design, but in Nature, Power, and Glory, unless we worship those who *are by Nature no Gods*, contrary to *Gal.* iv. 8. or give that *Glory* to Christ, which is appropriated to the supreme Being alone, contrary to *Isa.* xlii. 8. But,

First, If we may worship one, who is by Nature no God, then 'tis obvious, that the Heathens were only to blame for the Number of their Gods; or for paying divine Honours to them when not commanded; but the Apostle plainly fixes a Charge of Idolatry upon them, *for doing Service to them which by Nature are no Gods*: The

Reader may eaſily ſee 'tis not for doing it without divine Authority, not for miſtaking the Perſon or Perſons who were Gods by Office, but for giving it to thoſe who were *Idols*, and no true Gods; which Accuſation he muſt very *oddly* draw up againſt them, if, by the Chriſtian Doctrine, divine Worſhip was *commanded* to be given to one who was not God by Nature; for how juſtly might they have recriminated and ſaid, with what a Face can you level your Reproaches againſt us for being Idolaters, in worſhiping thoſe who are not by Nature Gods? do not ye worſhip a God *by Office*, that *depends* on the ſupreme God for all the Power he is veſted with, and is no more a God by neceſſity of Nature, in Reality and Truth, than thoſe we adore and invocate? Where is the Juſtice of the Charge, that what is *Idolatry* in us ſhould be none in you? Theſe things might eaſily have been retorted, had there been any room for them: But in ſhort, the Caſe was this, *another God*, beſides the ſupreme Being, was never known in the *Dawn* of Chriſtianity; neither the Law nor the Prophets, Chriſt nor his Apoſtles, ever intimated any thing like it, but all *conſpire* in this *fundamental* Rule, that divine Worſhip is his incommunicable Due; and all that depart from this primary and perpetual Law, that ſet up a God by Office, and pay him *religious* Worſhip, introduce *new* and incomprehenſible Myſteries in our Religion, Myſteries *hidden from Ages and Generations paſt*, and never yet made known by divine Revelation, unleſs it be ſuch a Revelation as *Socinus* pretended to, concerning the Meaning of that Text, *He came down from Heaven*, &c. which, as he wanted Reaſon to ſupport, conſiſtent with his Hypotheſis, he pretended 'twas reveal'd to him, *viz.* * " That Chriſt, before he " enter'd upon his prophetick Office, was taken up in- " to Heaven to be inſtructed in the Goſpel, and then " *came*

* See *Sherlock*. Vindic. Notes on *Athanaſius*, p. 141.

it *came down from Heaven* again, to publiſh it to the "World:" Which is ſo aukward a Diſcovery, and ſo contrary to the whole *Hiſtory* of the New Teſtament, that few, who have their Eyes open to read it, can eaſily, one would think, aſſent to the *waking* Dreams of a warm and pregnant Fancy. But,

Secondly, if the *ſame* Faith and Obedience is due to the Son as the Father, then we ought to give that Glory to Chriſt which the Scriptures appropriate to the ſupreme Being; which, ſuppoſing our Lord to be inferior to the Father, ſaps the very *Foundation* of Chriſtianity, and ſhakes all the *Pillars* of Reaſon.

It thwarts the whole *Spirit* and Deſign of the Goſpel, which was adapted to *raze* out all the Footſteps of *Idolatry*; and it had this glorious Effect, wherever it firſt ſpread, by its irreſiſtible Light, to diſpel, in a great Meaſure, the thick Fogs of Ignorance, Superſtition, and falſe Worſhip; to pluck up by the Roots the Seed of Idolatry, ſown by the grand *Enemy* of Mankind, to overturn his throng'd *Oracles*, demoliſh his Temples, and ſpoil the Craft of his hoodwink'd Prieſts: And ſhould we now admit a ſupreme and ſubordinate God, and Worſhip to be paid to each, we ſhould lay a Foundation for introducing *Idolatry* into the World again; for ſince the *Diſtance* between God and his Creatures is taken away in the Affair of Worſhip, and it may be *lawful* to worſhip one who is not the ſupreme Being, there is nothing left to determine it, but the *Declarations* of his Will; and how ſoon might a Man of *Socinus*'s Thought, by a luſty *Spring* of Imagination, find out more Objects of Worſhip? or, at leaſt, if Men ſhould once come to have little or no Reverence for the divine Precept, they may gradually ſlide into the Sink of Idolatry, and know no Bounds to their Superſtition. But would we only liſten to the Dictates of true Reaſon, we might, perhaps, eaſily diſcern the Notion of paying religious Worſhip to one, who is not God over all, ſubverſive of all the Prin-

ciples of natural Religion; for if Christ is not God equal to the Father, he must be infinitely distant from him both in Dignity and Duration; for there is no possible *Medium* between finite and infinite; and consequently, no divine Honours, no religious Adoration, can be due to him, according to the strict Sentiments of sound Reason, which knows but one supreme Being that is adorable, even the Maker of Heaven and Earth; and was it agreeable to the Law of Nature to admit more than one God the Object of religious Worship, it had been no Crime in them that worship'd *many* Gods, if they chanc'd to live before the giving of a *positive* Law from Heaven to the contrary: Nor can the most fulsome Idolatries be chargeable with Sin among the *Indians* and others, who never heard of the Law of *Moses*, or the Gospel of *Jesus*; for unless they transgress some Law, they do not actually sin; consequently, supposing it consistent with the Law of Nature to worship more than one God, they are innocent, and as little liable to the Charge of Idolatry, as he that worships the one living and true God, which I scarce believe any Christian can think. And add to this, since the Scriptures assure us that God will not give his Glory to another, because he is true to his Word and *cannot*, and unchangeably just to himself and *will not*, 'tis evident, that tho' Christ be another Person, he is not *another God* from the Father, but one and the same Jehovah; and what tho' there may be insuperable Difficulties in conceiving the Doctrine of the Trinity, that perplex and nonplus our Thoughts, I leave it to the serious Consideration of the calm Enquirer, whether 'tis not far more easy and justifiable, to suppose the Truth of it (as 'tis reveal'd) than to believe at the same time it should be both an indispensable *Duty*, and a flagrant *Sin*, to worship any but the true God, which is a manifest Contradiction in Morality; and certainly, 'twould be a Favour to the World, receiv'd with Gratitude, would some of the Anti-trinitarians, of the quickest

quickeſt Acumen and refin'd Thought, who are beſt form'd for ſtrong Reaſoning, attempt to ſet this Queſtion in a proper Light, *viz.*

Whether the Command of God, who has abſolutely and *ſtrictly forbidden* the leaſt divine religious Worſhip to be paid to any Being beſides himſelf, may be ſuppos'd, *after this*, to make another Being worthy of divine Adoration, who, ſuperceding ſuch a Command, is by Nature infinitely *unworthy* of it, and in all reſpects an *unfit* Object?

Till this be *fairly* done, they, who are not already plung'd into the growing and *faſhionable* Errors of the Day, ſhould, in juſtice to their own Reaſon, as well as regard to the ſacred Writings, make a full Pauſe; for if it be Idolatry to give divine Worſhip to a Creature, and Chriſt is no more, we are in danger of running into a Sin of a hideous and frightful Aſpect (as the Scriptures every where repreſent it) or if it be pleaded that the *Command* of God is our Warrant for giving this Worſhip to an inferior Being (beſides what has been already ſuggeſted) that the Reader may ſee the Invalidity of this Plea, let him only conſider, that Idolatry, which is in itſelf a Sin, and was always ſo accounted by God himſelf under the Old Teſtament, is now under the New Teſtament become a *neceſſary* Duty; which is little elſe than overthrowing the *natural* and eternal Differences between Good and Evil, and making Idolatry, which is one of the *worſt* of Crimes, a mere arbitrary, accidental, innocent thing. But doubtleſs, all Men of ſerious Taſte and true Piety will readily acknowledge, that practical and moral Difficulties, in Matters of Religion, are far more to be regarded than what is barely ſpeculative and intellectual, becauſe Religion was deſign'd more as a Guide of our Conduct and Life, than to ſatisfy a curious and prying Temper. Theſe are heavy Clogs upon the new Scheme, which I deſpair of ever ſeeing removed; and therefore will venture to ſay, that as long as

the *first Commandment* ſtands recorded in the 20th Chapter of *Exodus*, two ſeparate Objects of divine Worſhip, *one* a God by Nature, and the *other* a God by Office, can never be reconciled with that punctual and expreſs Command, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before me.* To what a deſperate Pinch muſt the *Arians* be reduc'd upon this Argument of Worſhip, if they would act fairly and above board, and not retreat to their *Coverts* of Ambiguity? for in ſhort, all who deny the Godhead of the Son, *i. e.* of his being of one Nature with the Father, muſt hold either that our bleſſed Saviour is but *a mere Creature*, however dignified above others, which, ſuppoſing his proper Divinity, is *direct* Blaſphemy; and that this eminent and exalted Creature is to be worſhiped with divine Honours, which is running into the *Dregs* of Idolatry, and entrenching upon the *Rights* of Heaven; or elſe, with a *Swarm* of foreign *Socinians*, that Chriſt *is not* to be worſhiped at all, which is repugnant to the whole Stream of Scripture and Antiquity, and differing with all, that in *every Place call upon the Name of Jeſus Chriſt our Lord, both theirs and ours*, concerning the *Object* of their Faith, Hope, Love, and Adoration.

But againſt this, the latter Clauſe of the Text ſtands as an *unſhaken* Bulwark. *He that honoureth not the Son, honoureth not the Father that ſent him.*

Theſe Words may *flaſh* the brighteſt Conviction of our Lord's Dignity and Godhead; they don't *darkly* intimate, but plainly prove, that the Son of God muſt be honour'd with the ſame divine Homage and Adoration as his eternal Father; and that God will own none for his true Worſhipers, but thoſe who thus honour his coequal Son. So that in vain do they pretend to be *zealous* for the Father's Honour, who neglect, deſpiſe, and diſhonour the Son; for he that honoureth not the *Son*, in the ſame Manner, and with the ſame Faith, Obedience, and Adoration, as the Father, diſhonoureth the Father who hath ſent his beloved Son into the World, atteſted with undeniable

deniable *Evidence* of Original divine Power and Authority, which is a ſhining Diſplay of his true Godhead. And tho' this Text may look with an ill Aſpect upon all who *confeſſedly* deny divine Honours to the Son of God, it ought not to be thought *harſh* or unwarrantable, if a juſt Explication of it ſhould *point* out their Danger; eſpecially, ſeeing 'tis confirmed in other Places of Scripture, *for whoſoever denies the Son has not the Father*;* whereas *he that hath the Son hath Life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not Life:* And ſeeing *no Man can ſay that Jeſus is Lord but by the Holy Ghoſt, beware leaſt any ſpoil you* (ſays the Apoſtle) *thro' Philoſophy and vain Deceit, after the Tradition of Men, after the Rudiments of the World, and not after Chriſt; for in him dwelleth all the Fullneſs of the Godhead bodily*; not of divine Dominion, Power, and Authority, as ſome *turn* the Words, but of the real divine Nature. But ſuppoſing their Gloſs to be genuine, as Dr. *Fiddes* obſerves, "'twould ſerve to little "purpoſe, ſince it can never be believed by any rational "Man, that a Perſon, who is not ſtrictly and eſſentially "God, ever had, or ever can have, all the Power, Au"thority, or Dominion of God; it is to no effect, to "ſay that Divinity is only an Attribute, and that there "is a Difference between the Godhead and the divine "Nature, the latter properly denoting Subſtance; for "let Godhead or Divinity ſignify an Attribute, as well "as the Word Infinity, or Omnipotence, yet Divinity "can be no where without a *divine Subſtance*, any more "than Infinity can be any where without *ſomething in*"*finite*; or almighty Power without a *Subject* wherein it "reſides."† The Father and Son then muſt be one eternal Being, ſeeing the divine Nature or Godhead is indiviſible; and as the eſſential Attributes, Dignity, and Excellency of the Deity, are the only Baſis and

* 1 John ii. 23. v. 12. 1 Cor. xii. 3. Col. ii. 8. † Vol. 1. p. 421.

Foundation of divine Worſhip, what is due to the Father is due to the Son, as the ſupreme Being; ſo that to deny him divine Honours is a Reflection and a Diſparagement to the Father, as well as an undervaluing his Love, in ſending him into the World.

But to ſolve all this, 'tis offered, † that Worſhip may be ſupreme and ſubordinate, viz. *that we ought to eſteem every Being, that has any valuable Qualifications in it, according to the Degree of them. God* ſupremely *or above all, becauſe he is the beſt, moſt amiable, and the greateſt of Beings; yet we may eſteem and love a good Man* ſubordinately, *according to the Degree of his Goodneſs*, &c.

All this is freely granted, and what will it amount to? No more than that ſupreme divine Worſhip, which is God's incommunicable Due, muſt be reſerv'd for him alone, as *ſuitable* to the Dignity of his Being; and that ſubordinate inferior Eſteem, Love, Honour, and the like, may be *ſafely* given to a good Man, ſuitable to his reſpective Worth: But this is not higher, or lower, properly, but a quite *different kind* of Honour; for that which is paid to God is ſtrictly *divine*, whereas the Honour or Eſteem paid to the good Man, is meerly *civil* Reſpect, which differs *toto Cælo*, even in ſome reſpects, as much as the Creature is diſtant from the Creator, where there can be no *Degrees* of Compariſon: And if the Author will call *divine* Worſhip, which is God's peculiar, *ſupreme*; and *civil* Worſhip, or Reſpect, which is due only to fellow Creatures, *ſubordinate*; there will be no diſſenting Vote; and then, tho' Chriſt be a Creature according to the *Arian* Hypotheſis, he may have the latter paid to him without Danger of incurring the Guilt of Idolatry; but then he will be worſhip'd with *no divine* Honours at all, contrary to the expreſs Tenor of Scripture. The Queſtion then is not, whether there

† Unity, p. 38.

there be ſupreme and ſubordinate Worſhip, the one divine, appropriated to God alone, the other civil, due to his Creatures; *ſince this is agreeable to Reaſon, and to the Practice of all Mankind, of the beſt of Chriſtians as well as others*: But here lies the *Pinch* of the Argument, whether there be *Degrees* in divine Worſhip, in that Honour that is appropriated to the great God, when he has *ſworn, he will not give his Glory to another.* This the Author ſhould have vindicated and clear'd up before he attempted to aſſign what Worſhip is due to our Lord, and not left the *unwary* Reader bewilder'd in more *groſs Confuſion* than can with any Colour of Juſtice be charg'd on the Presbyterian Litany, which is a Fling that looks very mean, conſidering who throws it; and the very trifling Occaſion taken to cavil; for he may know that the Graces of the holy Spirit, influencing the Minds of Men, and all his precious Gifts, are by a uſual Metonymy in Scripture call'd by the Name of the Holy Spirit; and agreeable to this God has promis'd, *he will give his Spirit to every one that asks it*; and ſurely then we may pray, to Father, Son, and Holy-Ghoſt, the great God, *and the Father of Lights*, from whom comes every Bleſſing; *Let thy Spirit dwell in us*, without the leaſt Abſurdity. But this by the way.

Having thus *wrapt* up his Subject in Darkneſs, he proceeds to offer ſome *glimmering* Conjectures, how the Worſhip due to Chriſt may be regulated: He ſuppoſes him to *know our Hearts, to be impower'd by the Father, to beſtow all our Bleſſings, and that we may ask them of him, and thank him when we have received them; but that the Father muſt be eſteem'd and loved as the principal and original Author of all Mercies, and the Son only as the Means of conveying them to us; or as the Father's Agent in beſtowing them, who therefore undoubtedly deſerves Worſhip, but not in the ſame degree as the Father, who is the ultimate Object of it.* *

If

* Unity, p. 39.

If he means by this Paragraph, which I have contracted for Brevity's Sake, tho' given the Senſe of it as near as poſſible in his own Words, that the Son may deſerve a ſubordinate, *i. e. civil Homage* or Addreſs, without breaking in upon the divine Prerogative, 'tis too plain to be denied; for, abſtracting all his ſupereminent Perfections as Son of God, we might ſafely ask a Favour that was *in his Power* to grant, and thank our Benefactor when we receiv'd it; was he only a Man, we might likewiſe eſteem, honour, and love him, *proportionable* to his Value: But then how is the Son *honour'd even as the Father*, with a like *Subjection* of Soul and Conſcience; and in the Performance of *all* thoſe religious Duties, which are *due* to God alone?

Or if he means that the Son has more than a civil, even proper divine Worſhip paid to him, tho' in a *lower* Degree than the Father, he ſhou'd firſt have prov'd either from Reaſon, or Scripture, that there were Degrees in divine Worſhip, and *fix'd* on what Degree of it is due to Chriſt, leaſt we ſhould exceed therein, and ſo *derogate* from the Father's Glory: 'Till this is done, he does but take for granted what he can never prove, and ſo will *never* be allow'd; eſpecially when the Scriptures aſcribe divine Honours and Adoration to Chriſt, which is proper to God only, and which the glorious Work of Redemption, accompliſh'd by him, is a ſtrong and almoſt *invincible* Motive to give him. Hence St. *Chryſoſtome* gives this as one Reaſon, why the Son of God was incarnate, to become the Saviour and Redeemer of Mankind; becauſe if it had been poſſible for a Creature to undertake and effect our Redemption, Men would never have thought they could have Eſteem enough for him, or have made due Expreſſions of their Gratitude, unleſs they had deify'd him, and committed Idolatry in worſhiping him, and paying him all divine Honours; and to prevent this in *Moſes*, who was but a temporal Deliverer, and but a *Type* of Chriſt, his Sepulchre

chre was conceal'd from the *Israelites*. So dear is the Memory of great and generous Benefactors wont to be, that Men are apt to think they never can be sufficiently grateful to them, unless they even adore and worship them, which was one chief Occasion of Idolatry among the Heathens; therefore the Redemption of the whole World was a thing that could only belong to the Son of God, to whom all Love and Reverence, all Worship and Adoration is due. *

But let us see what the Author drives at under the *Shelter* of his confus'd Distinction of Worship into supreme and subordinate; and as he has stated it, I conceive, he can *justly* intend no more than a *bare* civil Respect and Worship due to Christ; tho' at the same time I believe he aims at something else equally liable to Exception, *viz.* that the Worship paid to our Lord is only *relative* as MEDIATOR, and so of an inferior Degree, than what is offer'd *ultimately* to the Father.

This he endeavours to support by three Particulars. †

1st. *That the Father is the supreme and ultimate Object of Worship.*

2dly. *That Christ is to be Worship'd only as Mediator.*

3dly. *That all Worship, which is to be given to Christ, must and does redound to the Glory of his God and Father.*

The Force of all which Arguments I shall impartially examine.

1st. I shall enquire whether the Father is the supreme ultimate Object of Worship, *exclusive* of the Son and Holy Ghost.

That there is but *one* ultimate Object of Worship, who is the supreme Cause, the first efficient and last End of our Beings, we all own. The Question then between

* See *Jenkin's* Reasonableness of the Christian Religion, Vol. 2. p. 366.
† Unity, p. 39.

tween us is, whether this God be one Person or three Persons (I don't mean *separate* distinct Persons as among Men;) and tho' the Light of Nature teaches us there is a God, yet what he is, and what proper Apprehensions we ought to have of his glorious Being, none but himself, who is only wise, is able to describe to us; so that our Ideas of him shou'd be *regulated* according to the Discoveries he has made of himself in the inspired Writings. This Question then the Holy Ghost in Scripture must *determine* for us: We could never have known by our deepest Searches, and highest Improvements of Reason, that the supreme Being, which exists necessarily and eternally, and is every way absolutely perfect, was Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in one eternal, undivided Godhead, had we not been led by express Revelation to form such a Conception of him: There we read of three Persons, as the *joint* Object of our Homage and solemn Worship. † *Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.* Mention also is made of the *three* Persons in *John* 15. 26. *But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of Truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me.* And so Chap. 16. 14, 15. *He shall glorify me, for he shall receive of mine, and shall shew it unto you; all things that the Father hath are mine: Therefore said I, that he shall take of mine, and shall shew it unto you.* If we only compare these two last Citations together, 'twill be a Demonstration of three Persons in one Godhead; for if we may attend to Truth it self, nothing can be plainer than that here are three Persons spoken of, and such a perfect *Communication* of all things between them, as the *Property of each*, that nothing less than an *undivided Unity* of Nature and Power can be concluded from it: But not to be here too tedious in the Examination of every particular Testimony to this Doctrine, I shall refer the Reader to the Places in the Mar-

† *Matth.* xxviii. 19.

Margin. * And finally, without recurring to the Old Teſtament, where are many and no *feeble Hints* of a Plurality of Perſons in the Godhead, or ſearching out all that are in the New, let 1 *John* 5. 7. be fairly conſidered; *for there are three that* bear *Record in* Heaven, *the Father*, *the Word*, *and the Holy Ghoſt*; *and theſe three are one.* If theſe be the expreſs Words of Revelation, they will bid fair to reduce the Controverſy to an Iſſue; and therefore it has been thought *expedient* by our Adverſaries to reject the Text as ſpurious and interpolated: But thus to raiſe Objections againſt the Authority of the Books and Verſes they can't *reconcile* to their *Hypotheſis*, to cry out of corrupt and falſe Copies, wrong Tranſlations, Interpolations, and every thing elſe that may render thoſe Places *ſuſpicious* that make againſt them, and even to add *new Scriptures* to the ſacred Canon, to keep their Friends in Heart, looks as if their Cauſe was weak and tottering, to need ſuch little Methods to ſupport it. But let us ſee what is objected againſt this Paſſage; and the chief Pretence is, *that 'tis not found in the moſt antient Copies of the Greek, nor cited by the Antients.* Waving the Enquiry into the Fact, which may ſhortly be done by better Hands, I would only lay down this Poſition:

That this Verſe was either *raz'd out* by the *Arians*, or ſince *added* by the Trinitarians to *ſerve* their Cauſe, and let the Reader judge which of the two is moſt *probable* by the following Hints.

1ſt. St. *Jerom*, about thirteen hundred Years ſince, aſſures us, that this Verſe was found in the Copies he had; and publickly complains, and conteſts it, that in thoſe Copies where 'twas wanting, 'twas *expung'd* by the *Arians*, becauſe 'twas an undeniable Proof of the Trinity in Unity.

2dly.

* *Luke* i. 35. *John* xiv. 16, 26. compared with *John* x. 30. and *Acts* v. 4. *Gal.* iv. 6. 1 *Cor.* xii. 6, 11. 2 *Cor.* xiii. 14.

2*dly*. *Tertullian*, who lived long before this, plainly cites this very Paſſage in ſome of his Writings.

3*dly*. *Cyprian* alſo, who wrote before *Arius* was born, and conſequently, as Dr. *Hammond* obſerves, before the Time in which there could be any Motive to have made this Inſertion, cites this Paſſage: His Words are, the Lord ſaith, *I and my Father are one*; and again, of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, it is WRITTEN, and *Theſe Three are one*. Mr. *Emlyn* has a Fetch to elude the Force of this; for he ſuppoſes *Cyprian* refers to the eighth Verſe, by a myſtical Interpretation of *the Water*, *the Blood*, *and the Spirit*, * as ſignifying Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt. But to cut off effectually his Way of arguing, I ſhall produce the Authority of Mr. *Emlyn* himſelf in the very Page before; where, endeavouring to ſpoil and baffle the Evidence of *Tertullian*, (who ſpeaking of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, ſays, *Theſe Three are one*, and 'tis WRITTEN the Father and I are one); the former of theſe Mr. *Emlyn* obſerves he ſpeaks for himſelf, *viz. Theſe Three are one*, not as any part of Scripture, as he ſays the next Words are, *viz.* 'tis WRITTEN, *the Father and I are one*. Now let the Impartial judge between one Page and another of this Author's, and ſee, whether, when *Cyprian* ſays 'tis written theſe three are one, this ſhould not denote it to be a part of Scripture, as well as *Tertullian*'s ſaying 'tis *written*, that the Father and I are one, for both ſay 'tis WRITTEN; and 'tis not ſurely *written* in the eighth Verſe, of Father, Son and Holy Ghoſt, that *theſe three are one*, and conſequently this Gentleman has offer'd a very juſt and *unanſwerable* Reaſon, why *Cyprian* could not allude to the eighth Verſe, but muſt refer to the ſeventh. Thus there is no Fence for Mortals infallibly to guard againſt Miſtake; Men of

* Enquiry, page 333.

of the brighteſt Genius, and moſt labour'd Learning, may ſometimes out run themſelves.

4thly. This Text was cited by *Athanaſius* in his Diſputes with *Arius*, and *Arius* never deny'd it to be *genuine* Scripture, which there is no Reaſon to doubt he would have done, had it been counted ſpurious in thoſe Days.†

5thly. Other Scriptures are exactly agreeable to this Place.

In *John* viii. 17, 18, our Lord cites the Law concerning the *Validity* of a Teſtimony by two or more Witneſſes; and then he reckons his *Father* for one Witneſs, and *himſelf* for another; he ſpeaks not here of the *Spirit*, becauſe *he himſelf was not glorify'd*, nor the Spirit yet manifeſted by that eminent and glorious *Effuſion*, which was to follow after his Aſcenſion; but he foretels, *Joh.* xv. 26. that this third Witneſs was to be ſent from the Father by him: And how agreeable is this to the Paſſage under Conſideration, where Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt are ſaid to *teſtify* to this Truth the ſacred Penman was endeavouring to eſtabliſh, *viz. that Jeſus is the Son of God?* § And this Teſtimony of all three Witneſſes is *divine*; ſo that if the Authority of one of them is queſtionable, all upon the ſame Grounds may be rejected; becauſe their Teſtimony is of *equal* Authority, diſtinct, perſonal, and divine; if not diſtinct and perſonal, they could never be ſaid to be three Witneſſes; and if not divine, our Faith, which is built on their Teſtimony, would not be divine; and if we disbelieved the Teſtimony, *we ſhould make God a Liar.* ¶ But,

6thly. If we ſuppoſe this Text abſent, the Senſe of the Context will be lame and imperfect, and the *Connection* of the Argument broken; for not only the Copulative Καὶ, *and*, which join theſe Words with the enſuing Verſe, muſt be thrown out, but the Argument of the 9th Verſe

† See *Cheynel* of the Trin-unity, pag. 255.
§ Ver. 5. Ver. 9. ¶ Ver. 10.

Verſe entirely loſt: Verſe 9, *If we receive the Teſtimony of Man, the Teſtimony of God is greater.* How could there be any Compariſon between the Teſtimony of Man and God, unleſs there had been before mention made of the three Witneſſes in Heaven, as well as the three Witneſſes on Earth? their Number, we ſee, is *equal*, and their Teſtimony *agree* in one; but to convince us that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are not only one in Conſent and Teſtimony, as the three Witneſſes on Earth are, but one in a far higher manner, there is a very remarkable *Variation* of the Phraſe to expreſs it; 'tis ſaid of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, ἕτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἓν εἰσι, theſe three are one; and of the three Witneſſes on Earth, καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν, and theſe three agree in one.

7thly. The expunging of this Text may with more Reaſon be imputed to a *Fraud* on the *Arians* ſide, than on the Catholicks; for the Neceſſity of it, and Inducement to it, as Dr. *Hammond* well obſerves, was far greater and *more preſſing* on their part, having not ſo much from Scripture or Reaſon to defend their Cauſe as the Trinitarians have. And add to this, 'twas no uncommon thing, as St. *Ambroſe* aſſures us, for Hereticks to raze out thoſe Paſſages of Scripture, that refuted their *beloved* Errors: He acquaints us of ſome, particularly, that blotted out thoſe Words, *Joh.* iv. 24, *God is a Spirit*; and how eaſily might the *Arians* play the ſame Game, when they had it in their Power? Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory is too full of their Juggles; "how they made uſe of "their Intereſt at Court, when any Prince was a profeſs'd "Patron of their Cauſe; how they try'd their carnal "Policy in every conſiderable Place to pack Councils, "to forge or corrupt Creeds, ſeduce all ſorts of Men "who were led more by Intereſt than Scripture, and then "to evade, or comply with ſubtle Diſtinctions, mental "Reſervations, Equivocations, and ſuch unworthy Shifts, "to ſave themſelves from Cenſure in a Time of Re-

"formation."

" formation." ‡ I produce not this to caſt any Reproaches upon the preſent *Patrons* of this Cauſe, many of whom are Men of Learning and Probity; and God forbid they ſhould ever run to ſuch *Lengths* of Villany and Diſſimulation. But 'tis pity ſome of them ſhould be ſo unwilling to ſee and own the inevitable Conſequences of their Principles; ſo loth to bring their Scheme to full Light, freed from Ambiguity, and fairly *laid open* to the World. But enough of this.

Upon the Whole; let the *impartial* Enquirer ſeriouſly weigh theſe Hints above; and I doubt not he will be led to think that the *Arians* took Care to raze out ſo famous a Text againſt them from all the Copies they could meet with, rather than that the Trinitarians ſhould forge theſe Words, and inſert them in the Text of the Bible, when their Cauſe might be *maintained*, ſuppoſing them *excluded* from the ſacred Canon; for 'tis evident from the Scriptures (beſides thoſe many Texts wherein is expreſs mention of Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt,) that thoſe Names and *Titles*, which are peculiar to the ſupreme Being, and whereby God has made himſelf *known* to the World; the moſt eſſential and incommunicable *Properties* and *Perfections* of the Deity, by which he is *infinitely diſtinguiſh'd* from every Creature; the *Operations* and *Powers*, ſuch as thoſe of *Creation* and *Providence*, that are *appropriated* to him; and that *Worſhip*, *Homage*, and *Adoration*, which is due to the ſupreme Being, are all *aſcribed* to the Son, and either explicitly or implicitly to the Holy Ghoſt; and conſequently their Power is equal, their Perſons undivided, and their Glory one. 'Twould be needleſs for me to launch into the particular Examination of the ſeveral Paſſages that ſupport this, when 'tis already done in too ſtrong a manner to be weakened by the beſt Maſters of Criticiſm. I ſhall only therefore add this:

I Suppoſe

---

‡ *Beyond*, page 260.

Suppoſe an Heathen ſhould requeſt the Author to inſtruct him in the *Knowledge* of the only living and true God, and to ſhew the eſſential *neceſſary Difference* between him and all inferior Beings of higher or lower Rank; this, I am ſatisfied, he could no otherwiſe do than by ſhewing his Scholar wherein God hath made himſelf known to Mankind, *viz.* by his Titles, Perfections, Works, and Worſhip. Now, if the *very ſame Characters*, by which he ſhall deſcribe *the true God* to the infidel Enquirer, be aſcribed to the Son of his Love in the Holy Scriptures, (ſuppoſing he believe their Divinity and Authority) then as his Demonſtration of the Exiſtence, Dignity, and Nature of one ſupreme Being, is *juſt* and valid; ſo our Proofs of the eſſential Deity of Chriſt muſt be equally *ſtrong* and forcible; and conſequently, they having the ſame divine Nature, Excellency, Perfections, and Glory, and concurring in the ſame Works of Power and Mercy, the ſame Adoration and religious Acknowledgments are due to Father and Son, and by the ſame Reaſon to the Holy Ghoſt. There is not one *kind* of divine Honour due to the Father, and another to the Son; nor one *degree* of Honour due to the Father, and another to the Son; for there can be no Degrees imaginable in one and the ſame Excellency, which is undivided and infinite, and ſo exceeds all Bounds, and can have no Degrees; and if there be no Degrees in the *Excellency of the Object*, which is the Ground and *adequate* Reaſon of divine Honour and Worſhip, there can be no Reaſon for a Difference of Degrees in the *Worſhip itſelf* which is due; and conſequently, *all Men ſhould honour the Son, even as they honour the Father*, which might ſuffice. But as the Author has attempted to ſhew that the Perſon of the Father only is the true Object of *ultimate*, divine Worſhip, *excluſive* of the Son, and Holy Ghoſt, to ſet this important Affair, if poſſible, on a better footing, I ſhall enquire,

Firſt,

First, What we may understand by the Word *Father* in Scripture; when *joyn'd* to the Term of *God*, or spoken of him.

Secondly, Prove that divine Worship is paid, in the New Testament, *to the whole Trinity*, which will be a Demonstration that the supreme Being, who is the ultimate Object of Worship, is not *one Person*, but Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

1*st*, What we may understand by the Word *Father* in Scripture, when *joyn'd* to the Term God, &c. And,

1*st*, The Term *Father* is attributed to God *essentially*, and then it includes all the three uncreated Persons; because they are co-equal, and have one Nature, Will, Power, and Energy, and so one and the same supreme Deity, in opposition to every false feign'd God and Image, &c. which is sometimes called Father, as in *Jer.* ii. 27. *Saying to a Stock, thou art my Father*, &c. But to the utter Exclusion of every Idol God, the *Jews* acknowledge the supreme Being alone their God and Father, *Isa.* lxiii 16. *Doubtless thou art our Father, tho'* Abraham *be ignorant of us:* And in Chapter lxiv. 8. ועתה יהוה אבינו *But now, O Lord, thou art our Father, we are the Clay, and thou our Potter; and we are all the Work of thine Hand.* So *Psal.* lxxxix. 26. *He shall cry unto me, thou art my Father, my God, and the Rock of my Salvation.* In the same Sense 'tis frequently us'd in the New Testament, our Lord himself being the Interpreter, as in *Matth.* vi. 26. compar'd with *ver.* 30. and with *Luke* xii. 24, 28. *Matth.* x. 20, 29. *Luke* xii. 30, 32. as also in *Rom.* viii. 15, 16, &c. And that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are all jointly call'd upon, as our Father in the Lord's Prayer, is evident; for as God is the Father of all Men by Creation, and especially of Believers, by Redemption, Regeneration, and Adoption, these *Actions being common* to the whole Trinity, so likewise must the *Title* of Father, the Reason for it being the same: And all those Blessings that we pray for, flow from the Son

as well as the Father, *John* xiv. 13. *And whatsoever ye shall ask in my Name, I will do it.* The same may be said of the Holy Ghost, the Fountain and Giver of all spiritual Gifts, 1 *Cor.* xii. 11. *But all these worketh that one and the self-same Spirit, dividing to every Man severally as he will.* So that when our Lord says, *John* iv. 23. *The true Worshipers shall worship the Father*, there is no room for the Author's very charitable Innuendo. *(By the way then, are those the true Worshipers, who worship the Father, Son, and Spirit together, as one Being?)* For 'tis notorious and open to the most careless Reader, that our Lord was not in that Text instructing the Woman of *Samaria barely*, who was the true Object of her Worship, but chiefly in *what Manner* she, and all others, should worship the true God, *viz. in Spirit and Truth:* Which Words are artfully suppress'd, for what Reason the Author best knows. But allowing the Concealment, and supposing our Lord was only directing her to the right Object of Worship, the Term *Father* can't be here applicable to the first Person of the Trinity, exclusive of the Son and Holy Ghost; for he does not tell her the true Worshipers shall worship *my* Father, or make use of any Appellation or Phrase in the whole Chapter, that might lead us to think he spoke of his own Father, in a special Sense, as he was the Son of God; for he plainly says the Father, agreeable to the receiv'd Notion that God *was the Father of all*, which is explain'd by the very next Verse; *For God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in Spirit and in Truth.*

2*d'y*, The Term *Father* is us'd personally, and so attributed to a single Person of the Trinity.

1*st*, To the first Person, in most of those Instances the Author cites, who is *eminently* call'd Father, but not particularly with respect to us, but principally *in respect of Christ*, his only begotten Son from all Eternity; which Consideration is of vast and unknown Encouragement to us to worship him under so endearing a Character,

so

ſo ſweet and tender a Relation, *as the Father of our Lord Jeſus*, who even deigns to call us *Brethren*, ſeeing, as he has redeem'd us by the Blood of his Son, and thro' his Mediation adopted us into his Family and Favour, he is become to us *the Father of Mercies, and the God of all Comfort*, &c.* which is the utmoſt Support of our Faith, the Prop of our Hope, and the Foundation of all our *Peace* with Heaven, as we are Sinners; and hence the Apoſtle *wiſhes us Grace and Peace from God our Father, and from the Lord Jeſus Chriſt*:† Which ſhews that the Son is not hereby excluded from being God alſo, tho' the Father be firſt in order, and, in the myſterious Diſpenſations of Grace towards a loſt World, is repreſented in the Goſpel as the *Contriver*, the Son at the ſame time conſidered as the *Purchaſer*, and the Spirit the *Applier* of the great Salvation, &c.

2*dly*, As the firſt Perſon of the Trinity is called Father, ſo alſo is the ſecond, *Iſa.* ix. 6.

To us a Child is born, and unto us a Son is given; and his Name ſhall be called wonderful, the mighty God אבי עד *the Father of Eternity*, or the everlaſting Father, being the efficient Cauſe of the Creation, as God is called *the Father of the Rain*, becauſe the Contriver, Maker, and Giver of it. And even *Jubal*, the firſt Inventor and Framer of Muſick, is called *the Father of ſuch as handle the Harp.*‡ Chriſt then, being Creator of the World, is juſtly called Father in this Text; *for have we not all one Father? hath not one God created us? Is not he thy Father that hath bought thee? hath he not made thee?*§ And tho' the Original Word עד may ſometimes ſignify a determinate Space, yet being applied to God, the Meaning is quickly known by the *Subject* (which is from everlaſting) to denote Eternity; Chriſt then being here called the *mighty God*, 'tis an Explanation of the Word עד, which is uſed

* 2 Cor. i. 3. † Rom. i. 7. ‡ Gen. iv. 21. § Deut. xxxii. 6.

in this Sense, *Isa.* lvii. 15. *For thus saith the high and the lofty one that inhabiteth Eternity*, עד שכן. Some, I know, have been led to interpret it, the Father of *the future Age*, or Dispensation, which it must be allow'd to take in, seeing he who is *eternal* is the Father of all Ages; and so it equally serves what I produc'd it for, to shew that Christ is styl'd Father, and he is eminently *the everlasting Father*, as he is the *Author of eternal Life to them that obey him*; * who are therefore called his Children, *Heb.* xvii. 14.

3*dly*, The third Person in the Trinity, 'tis obvious, is described as our Father; for all, that *are renew'd in the Spirit of their Minds*, are *born* of the Holy Ghost; 'tis his proper *Office*, in the Oeconomy of Man's Salvation, to give us *a new Birth*, as 'tis for the *Father* to give us Life, Being, and Motion at first.

Thus having enquir'd into the Meaning of the Term *Father*, when spoken of God, it appears, that, when taken *essentially*, 'tis applicable to the whole Trinity, in *opposition* to all Idols; or, when taken *personally*, may be applied to *each uncreated* Subsistent in the supreme Godhead. Which brings me to shew,

2*dly*, That divine Worship is expressly paid *to the whole Trinity*; which will be a Demonstration that God, who is the ultimate Object of Worship, is not *one Person*, but Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.

The Author conceives Prayer to be the *chiefest Part* of Worship; and as he thinks *no single Prayer is directed to the whole Trinity*, † he concludes that the Person of the Father is the ultimate Object of Worship, *because our Prayers are directed to him*. By the same Rule, to whomsoever Prayer, as an *Act of divine Worship*, is directed, he must necessarily be suppos'd to be the *ultimate* Object of Worship. So that the Argument is equally strong

* Heb. v. 9. † Unity, p. 40.

ſtrong for the Worſhip of the Son and Holy Ghoſt, as the Father, if we can find any Prayer in Scripture *directed* to them. Let us ſee then as briefly as poſſible,

Firſt, Whether any *Prayer* is directed to our Lord Jeſus Chriſt; and can this be deny'd or ſhuffled off? 'Tis ſo open and manifeſt a Truth, that the Author is compell'd quietly to own, *there are two or three directed to Chriſt.* And is it not ſurprizing, that he ſhould make the Perſon of the Father the only ultimate Object of Worſhip then, when religious Prayers are alſo directed *immediately* to the Son? What a noble Teſtimony did good *Stephen*, in his laſt Moments, when upon the Edge of Eternity, bear to this Truth? This firſt brave Martyr for the Chriſtian Cauſe, being full of the Holy Ghoſt, prays directly to the great Redeemer, ſaying, *Lord Jeſus, receive my Spirit*; and again he kneeled down and cry'd with a loud Voice, *Lord, lay not this Sin to their Charge.** In his firſt Supplication, wherein he commits *his departing Soul* into the Hands of Chriſt, he aſcribes unto him *divine Omniſcience, Love, and Power*; and in the latter Petition for his Enemies (which was ſuch a Prayer as Chriſt offered upon the Croſs to his Father) he acknowledges Chriſt's *Power to forgive Sin*, and intreats that his Mercy may be exerciſed in their Pardon: And not only *Stephen*, but the *whole Body* of the primitive Chriſtians, made their Addreſſes to their Lord and Saviour, inſomuch that they were even characteriz'd, diſtinguiſh'd, and known, *by their calling upon the Name of Jeſus Chriſt our Lord.** And that this is meant of directing their Prayers to Chriſt, is obvious from the like Phraſe in *Joel* ii. 32. *And it ſhall come to paſs, that whoſoever ſhall call upon the Name of the Lord ſhall be delivered.* This very Place is cited by the Apoſtle, and applied to the bleſſed Saviour of the World, in *Rom.* xvi. 12, 13. where he

 tells

* Acts vii. 59, 60. † 1 Cor. i. 2. *compar'd with* Acts ix. 14.

tells us, that the *Jews* and the *Greeks* had one God, or Lord, without *any Difference*; *for*, says he, *the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him.* Which being spoken *expressly* of Christ, he must be the *ultimate* Object of divine Worship with the Father. And what more shining Testimony of this, than that fervent Petition address'd to our Lord, with which the sacred Canon is concluded, *Surely* (says Christ) *I come quickly. Amen*, his holy Church ecchoes back, *Come, Lord Jesus, come quickly.*

Secondly, Prayers are in Scripture *directed* to Father and Son *jointly*; *Now God himself and our Father, and our Lord Jesus Christ, direct our way unto you*, 1 Thess. iii. 11.

Thirdly, To Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, 2 *Cor.* xiii. 14. *The Grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all.*

Which solemn Benediction has entirely the Nature and *Force* of a Prayer, and is nothing else but the Apostle's Address to Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, express'd by *a passionate Wish*; a vehement Request, for his *beloved Corinthians*, that these various divine Blessings might be *communicated* to them. And can it be suppos'd the great Apostle *Paul* would thus equally pray to them all, or equally bless in their Names, unless they were all equally God, equally the *Fountain* of all these Mercies? The like Form of praying or blessing we have in *Revel.* 1. 4, 5. *Grace be unto you, and Peace from him, which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven Spirits which are before his Throne, and from Jesus Christ who is the faithful Witness, and the first begotten of the Dead, and the Prince of the Kings of the Earth.* All that can be objected against this Place is, that by this Phrase seven Spirits may be meant *Angels*, because the Spirit is one, and not seven. But can it ever be thought that the Angels are the Fountain of Grace and Peace? or is it consistent with the Christian Faith to pray unto them, when God hath said so often, he will not give his Glory to another? And can this Passage with any Shadow

of

of Reaſon be explain'd of them? when, in this very Book of the Revelation, an Angel expreſly *forbids* it twice, and appropriates it to the ſupreme Being alone; ſaying, *worſhip God, worſhip God.* * This then muſt be meant of the Holy Ghoſt, who is here call'd *ſeven* Spirits, "becauſe a Number (ſays Biſhop *Burnet*) † "that imports both Variety and Perfection, and that "was the ſacred Number among the *Jews*. And ſuch "a myſtical Expreſſion is no extraordinary thing in a "Book that is all over myſterious; and it imports one "Perſon, from whom all the Variety of Gifts, Admini-"ſtrations, and Operations, that were then in the "Church, did flow." But I rather conceive this Phraſe, ſeven Spirits, has reference entirely to the ſeven *Churches of Aſia*, to whom this Book was written; and therefore (which firſt gave me the Thought, and ſtill confirms me in the Belief of it) 'tis repeated juſt *ſeven times*, and no more; *He that hath an Ear, let him hear what the Spirit ſaith unto the Churches.* § And if ſo, this can no more prove there are in reality ſeven Spirits (from whom theſe Bleſſings flow, which *none* but God can give) than that there are three Gods, when 'tis ſaid, the God of *Abraham*, the God of *Iſaac*, and the God of *Jacob*; and tho' the Spirit is here mention'd before the Son, the Son is elſewhere put before the Father: *Now our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and God, even our Father, comfort your Hearts, and eſtabliſh you in every good Word and Work.* ¶ Which intimates to us not obſcurely, that tho' there be a Priority of *Order* among the Perſons of the bleſſed Trinity; yet there is no *Precedence* in Dignity and Glory; which may ſerve to inſtruct us in that *pure* evangelical Worſhip, which is paid to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, as *one God*, by the *Mediation* of Jeſus Chriſt,

* Ch. xix. 10. xxii. 9. † Expoſit. of the 39 Articles. pag. 39.
§ Ch. ii. 7, 11, 17, 29. Ch. iii. 6, 13, 22. ¶ 2 Theſſ. ii. 16.

Chriſt, God-Man, and the *Aſſiſtance* of the Holy Ghoſt, which in all our Prayers, Praiſes, and Communion with God in all his Ordinances, is ſo *blended* together, as may eaſily lead us to apprehend that the whole Trinity have an equal *and undivided Share* in our Worſhip, tho' God for wiſe Ends hath eſtabliſh'd ſuch an admirable Order in the Conduct of his Mercy, and Love towards Sinners, as places the Son and Holy Ghoſt in a lower Office and Character than he bears in the glorious Work of our Redemption and final Salvation; which Characters however are not *inconſiſtent* with their exact Equality with the Father in Nature and Perfections, as none can well deny, any more than 'twas a degrading and a Diſparagement to the Father's *Dignity*, to aſſume the Character of *King of Iſrael*. According to this Order the Plot of infinite Wiſdom! as the Father is conſidered the *Source* of all Grace and Glory, and the Son as condeſcending to be ſent into the World to *purchaſe a peculiar People* to himſelf; and the Spirit proceeding from the Father and the Son, to compleat the whole *good Pleaſure* of God, in them and towards them; 'tis moſt natural to ſuppoſe the Father the Head and Fountain of all Mercy, and ſo is generally firſt in our Conceptions, when we addreſs our ſelves to the ſupreme Being in any Branches of divine Worſhip, tho', in all thoſe Acts of Homage and Adoration, the Son and the Holy-Ghoſt receive undivided Glory and Honour. Let us try a few Inſtances.

1*ſt*. In our Prayers: Tho' it be thro' the Mediation of Chriſt, *that we have Acceſs by one Spirit unto the Father*;† if once, by the ſweet *Influences* of the Spirit, we are ſtrengthen'd to plead with him, in the *Name of Chriſt*, for thoſe Bleſſings which are the *Fruits* of his Love, and the *Purchaſe* of his Son's Death (ſeeing he was *actually* God as

† Eph. ii. 18.

as well as Man, *that laid down his Life* for us, and by virtue of so glorious a Sacrifice our Sins are expiated) we shall be inviolably confirm'd in the practical Belief of a Trinity, maugre all the Blasts of cunning Dispute, and every new Puff of Doctrine that may arise to shake our Faith.

2*dly*, In our Praises: Tho' the Father be first in Order, yet all three Persons are so *inseparably* join'd, as may lead us to think their Glory to be undivided. *Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual Blessings in Heavenly Things in Christ.* * Tho' the *Spirit* in this Verse is not particularly mention'd, his Gifts, Graces, and Comfort, which are those spiritual Blessings here spoken of, *direct* our Eyes and Hearts towards him, as the *Author* of them also: *For the Fruit of the Spirit is Love, Joy, Peace,* &c. † Hence all those, who are made Partakers of these spiritual Blessings, are styl'd *elect, according to the Foreknowledge of God the Father, thro' Sanctification of the Spirit unto Obedience, and sprinkling of the Blood of Jesus Christ.* ‡ The same Spiritual Operations are ascribed to each, ¶ and so equal Homage and Thanksgiving is due; for every *Gift*, that flows from the Father of Lights, comes from the same Fountain of Goodness and Mercy, even Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as is evident, 1 *Cor.* xii. 4, 5, 6, *Now concerning spiritual Gifts, Brethren, I would not have you ignorant. There are Diversities of Gifts, but the same Spirit; and there are Differences of Administrations, but the same Lord; and there are Diversities of Operations, but it is the same God which worketh all in all.* Again,

3*dly*, In our Communion with God: Thus, 1 *Joh.* i. 3. *And truly our Fellowship is with the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ.* § We read also of the *Fellowship of the Spirit, and the Communion of the Holy Ghost*; which may teach us,

---

* Eph. i. 3. † Gal. v. 22. 23. ‡ 1 Pet. i. 2.
¶ Rom. xvi. 25. 1 Cor. i. 8. Eph. iii. 16. § 1 Cor. i. 9.

us, that those *refin'd* Pleasures, those sweet *Pangs* of Love, and those calm *Breezes* of Joy, which the holy Soul feels in conversing with Heaven, either in *secret* Devotion, or *publick* Ordinances, flow *mutually* from the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and those Graces of Faith and Love, those fiducial Breathings after God, which are exercis'd in these *pleasing* Moments, are fixed upon all the Persons of the Godhead, the Father of Mercies, the Prince of Peace, and the *God of all Consolation*, the blessed Comforter: So that notwithstanding there is an Order observ'd in evangelical Worship, wherein the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ is primarily considered, and generally address'd to in our Prayers, thro' the Mediation of his Son, and the Assistance of the holy Spirit, who helps our Infirmities; * this only teaches us the *Wisdom* of God, in establishing such a gracious Method to encourage and embolden guilty Sinners to come unto him for Pardon, and Life, in the Name of such a *prevailing* Advocate, *who is able to save to the uttermost*; who, being God as well as Man, and having lain down his Life for us, and so purchas'd our Ransom, is now gone up to Glory, as our *Forerunner*, to prepare a Place for us, and there *Ever Lives* enthron'd at the right Hand of God, to make successful *Intercession* for us. And why should we abridge our Lord of his original Glory, as God, because he was *pleas'd*, for our sakes, to sustain so low a Character as Man also? Is there no Disingenuity in it? can any one say, such a Dispensation of Wisdom and Love proves an *Inequality* of Honour and Dignity? or is there any room here for the Distinction of supreme and subordinate Worship? That there is not, will appear by considering,

4*thly*, That in the solemn Ordinance of Baptism, we are devoted to the Service, Faith, and Obedience of Father,

* Rom. viii. 26.

Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, the one ultimate divine Object of Worſhip.

Baptiſm being the Sacrament of *Initiation* into the viſible Church of Chriſt, an open and *avowed* Profeſſion of our ſerving the true God, and *renouncing* all other Religions but the Chriſtian, in this ſacred Solemnity, Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, are recogniz'd, acknowledg'd, worſhiped and obey'd, as the one true God, in oppoſition to all the *Gods* of the Heathen; yea, herein we renounce all the *Rivals* of God, *the Fleſh, the World, and the Devil*, and by an Oath of Allegiance we ſwear Obedience and *Fealty* to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, as our only Lord God; and ſo each Perſon is equally the ultimate Object of our Knowledge, Faith, Fear, Love, Deſires, Delight, Hope, and Truſt, and ſo declared to be our God, who hath an *inconteſtable Right* in us, and we are devoted to them all, *as one God* our Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier: For are we baptized in the *Name* of the Father? *i. e.* are we dedicated, by this ſacred Rite, to the Faith, Worſhip, and Service of God the Father? ſo we are devoted to the Faith, Worſhip, and Service of God the Son; we are liſted under his Banner, *who is the Captain and Author of our Salvation*, and are engag'd to pay him chearful Obedience and Submiſſion, as the only Lord and *Lawgiver* of Chriſtians: We are baptiz'd alſo in the *Name* of the Holy Ghoſt, and ſo profeſs to believe his Godhead, his Agency alſo in carrying on the Work of Redemption; and ſo to ſurrender ourſelves *abſolutely* to his Conduct and Operations, as our Sanctifier, Teacher, Guide, and Comforter. Thus are we baptiz'd, not into the *Names*, but into the *Name* of Father, Son, and Spirit; which is an Argument that theſe three *are one, and their Name one*, i. e. that they are of inſeparable Unity, of joint Power and Authority; for our Lord makes *no Difference* between being baptized in the Name of the Father, and the Name of the Son, and Holy Ghoſt; and conſequently, if they are not one in Nature

Nature and Glory with God the Father, and the supreme Object of Worship, the Distinction between God and his Creatures is hereby quite destroy'd, and we are devoted as absolutely and entirely to two Creatures, as to the everlasting Creator, which must needs derogate from the Honour of the supreme Being, and be no better than blank Idolatry, and a giving away his Glory. But can it be ever thought, that by this holy Institution, which was design'd to guard against all Creature-Worship, and to teach the *Gentile* Nations *to turn from their Vanities to the living God*, insomuch that Baptism became the Characteristick and *Badge* of those who were Christians; I say, can it be ever thought, that the Son and Holy Ghost, who are here proposed as the one Object of our Faith, Worship, and Obedience with the Father, are no more than Creatures?

This is so hard to digest, that our Adversaries themselves, as they can't reconcile it, endeavour to *lower* the Dignity of the Ordinance, and to interpret Baptism *to be only a Rite, by which we deliver ourselves to the Institution, Instruction, and Obedience of any Person or Persons, or by which we are baptized into the Profession of the Gospel Faith, or initiated in the Doctrine of Salvation, reveal'd by Father, Son, and Holy Ghost.* This is in part true, so far as we are obliged to receive the Gospel as the sole Rule of our Faith and Worship, and to acknowledge Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the *Authors* of our Religion, whose Authority is the same: So that in truth, this very Construction, if *duly* weigh'd, establishes the Doctrine of the Trinity; for to suppose any Authority *less* than divine *joined* with the Father, must be merely owing to Prepossession, or a strange and uncouth Imagination; for all three Persons are here named alike, and put upon the same *Level* one with another, that they should be *alike* owned, as the *one Fountain* of all Authority and Power; and if so, we are baptiz'd into the Profession of a Trinity of Persons in the uncreated Godhead.

But

But if we consider the Nature and Intent of Baptism, we shall easily discern that something more than this is meant by it; for as by the Sacrament of Circumcision (which has been thought analogous to Baptism) all *Proselytes* to the *Jewish* Religion were devoted to the true God, in opposition to all the *Idol Gods* of the Nations; which was also done *sometimes* by Baptism alone;* so our Lord, by instituting this Sacrament to be administred in the Name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, *hereby shews* who is the Object of the Christians Faith and Worship. And in this Sense it was understood in the primitive Church, the *Gentile Candidates* for Baptism being requir'd, "after having made a solemn Renuntia-"tion of Idolatry and false Worship, to profess their "Faith in, and Adherence to God the Father, Son, "and Holy Ghost, as the true and only God."† And if this be the living God, which the Scriptures reveal to us, 'twill be a sad Case if *we glorify him not as God:* May therefore the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory, *give unto us all the Spirit of Wisdom and Revelation, in the Acknowledgment of Christ* the *Lord of Glory*, ‡ and of the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Peace, and Love, and Grace: Then shall we be satisfied, that Faith, Worship, and Allegiance, is due not only to one Person, but inseparably to all three, *the one true Jehovah*, by whom we are *created, govern'd, redeem'd, sanctify'd, adopted, comforted,* and hope *finally* to be saved; in whose Name we are

* Moris erat Judæis, eos, qui falsorum deorum cultu deserto ad Cultum unius veri Dei accedebant, ita tamen ut non circumciderentur, aquâ abluere; per hunc ritum testantes, se relictis Idolis Deo vero velle servire, secundum Leges divinas Noacho & toti humano generi datas: Quod si & populo Israelis inseri vellent, & legis Mosaicæ esse observatores, fruique privilegiis populo illi peculiaribus, circumcidebantur: Sed si ab Idolis convertebantur, etiam aquâ lavabantur. Idemque mos & Hodie inter ipsos obtinere dicitur, si quis à Persis, Ismaelitis aut Turcis ad ipsos accedat. *Limborch. Theol. lib. 5. cap. 67. p. 600.*

† Waterl. Sermons, *p.* 316, *&c.* ‡ Eph. i. 14. Jam. ii. 1.

are baptiz'd, to whose Service we are solemnly devoted; in which, thro' the divine Assistance, let us resolve chearfully to live and die, *that our Hearts may be comforted, being knit together in Love, and unto all Riches of the full Assurance of Understanding, to the Acknowledgment of the Mystery of God, and of the Father, and of Christ, in whom are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge. And this I say, lest any Man should beguile you* (says the good Apostle) *with enticing Words*, Col. ii. 2, 3, 4.

CHAP. VII.

An Enquiry whether Christ is to be worship'd as invested *with the Office of Mediator*, and receiving Power from his Father as a Gift. *Wherein is demonstrated, that to worship him merely as such, as a separate inferior Being, instead of* redounding *to the Honour of the Father, sullies his divine Majesty, robs him of his unrival'd and peerless Glory; and is contrary to the whole* Tenor *of the Old and New Testament, that require us to* worship the Lord our God, and to serve him only.

THE Author attempts to prove that Christ is to be worship'd *only* as Mediator; and the better to explain his Meaning, he assigns two ways wherein this Worship may be paid him.*

First, *When we offer up our Prayers thro' him to the Father.*

This

---

* Unity, p. 41.

This I conceive can be in no Senſe proper religious Worſhip.

Secondly, *When we offer them directly to him.*

But as there is not one Precedent nor Example of any ſuch Prayer in all the Scripture offered directly to Chriſt, as Mediator, in the Author's Senſe, it has been the Cuſtom of the Church of Chriſt in all Ages, to addreſs themſelves to God the Father, *thro'* Chriſt as Mediator; and when any Prayer is directed *immediately* to our *bleſſed Lord*, he is then conſider'd, *not as acting* in his mediatory Office *towards God for us*, or *with us for and under God*, as the Author hints in his *Reply*, * but as one who hath infinite Perfections, abſolute Power, and the free Diſpoſal of all the good things we pray for, *&c.* as will be prov'd. But I muſt begin with the firſt Particular.

Firſt, *When we offer up our Prayers thro' Chriſt to the Father.*

There is no divine Worſhip paid to Chriſt as Mediator at all.

That our dear Lord, as Mediator, is the *Medium* of all our Converſe with Heaven, we gladly acknowledge, and rejoyce in it; for he is our prevailing Advocate, and kind Interceſſor, by whom we have *Acceſs* to God in all our unfeigned Supplications for Mercy, and thro' whom we find a *Welcome* at the Throne of Grace, and have Admiſſion to the divine Favour and Fellowſhip; by virtue of the Merits of whoſe Blood, pleaded for us, we are accepted even in *the beloved of God* and of our Souls. In this View, our Lord, agreeable to the Method of Salvation fix'd in the Goſpel, is conſider'd as the only *way* to God, by *whom we offer Sacrifices of Prayer and Praiſe*, † and have the Privilege of entring into *the Holy of Holies by his Blood*; thro' whom our Worſhip and Obedience;

* Pag. 33. † Heb. xiii. 15.

our Faith and Love, *centre* in God: We can't then have recourse to an Advocate, as the ultimate Object of Worship, he being consider'd only as the meritorious Cause of our Approach to the Seat of Mercy, and our *Acceptance* with the divine Majesty, as one *by whom* we come unto him, and are emboldened to fix an Eye of Hope upon a God of awful Glory and stern Justice, as a *reconcil'd Father*, Friend, and Benefactor, and so *thro' him our Faith and Hope is in God.* * So that, as Mediator, he is not an Object of Worship; it does not terminate upon him, nor is it directed to him, but to the one God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the supreme, the only Object of it.

Whence it appears, that we do not offer to *another Being, besides the Supreme* (as the Author suggests) *any religious Worship at all*; for our Lord, consider'd in his Office of Mediator, and receiving a *dispensatory* Kingdom and Authority, &c. is only the *Medium* thro' whom our Worship is paid to the one true God, and not the *Object* of it: For as the Scriptures know no other divine Worship, nor suitable Object of it, but one, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*; 'tis plain, that Christ, as Mediator, is not worship'd at all. And I conceive our Author, in his *Reply*, † has as good as determin'd it; for Dr. *Waterland* having demonstrated (by the Author's own Confession,) ‡ " That Prayer and " Thanksgiving, considered as Expressions, or Marks of " Honour, rest upon the same Foundation as Honour " doth, *i. e.* upon the intrinsick Excellency of the Ob- " ject;" in order to give new Light to it, § he refers the Reader to the sixth Chapter of *Daniel*, where *Darius* made a Law that no Petition should be offer'd to any one for thirty Days, save to the King only, under pain of High-Treason: " By that Law, Petitions for such a " Time

---

* 1 Pet. i. 21. † Pag. 47. ‡ Pag. 46. § Preface, p. 47.

" Time were appropriated to the Crown, became En-
" ſigns of royal Dignity and Majeſty, and Acknowledg-
" ments of Soveraignty, in the Perſon to whom they
" ſhould be offered." The Author, to evade the Force of this Illuſtration, having, in his uſual way, beg'd the Queſtion, by *ſuppoſing the Father to make ſuch a Law*, &c. deſires to add another *Circumſtance* to the Story of *Darius*, in order to ſhew how Chriſt may be worſhip'd as Mediator; *viz. Suppoſe* Darius, *after part of the thirty Days was expir'd, had iſſued out a new Decree, forbidding any Subject to approach into his Preſence, and requiring them to petition thro' his Son; that is, to bring their Petitions to his Son, that he might immediately preſent them to the King; in doing this the Petitioner could not have been charged with High-Treaſon, provided they had approach'd the Prince only as a Mediator between the King and them.*

Now let the impartial Enquirer judge, whether, by this *Illuſtration*, divine Worſhip is to be paid to Chriſt as Mediator at all. The Petitions, in this Inſtance of *Darius*, are conſider'd as *appropriated to the Crown, and Enſigns of Soveraignty*; by a new Decree, they are only ſuppos'd to be *convey'd* by the Hands of the King's Son to his Father. (The Author might as well have ſaid, by ſome of the King's Miniſters of State; for in all Courts, Petitions generally come thro' the Hands of ſome of them to the King; and, very probably, were not preſented immediately to King *Darius* without their Interpoſition.) But does this *alter the Nature* of the Petitions, or *change* the Object whoſe peculiar Due they are? No, ſurely theſe Petitions are ſtill the King's *Prerogative*, and he *alone* is petition'd by his Subjects, according to his Decree; and the Honour of the whole muſt be aſcrib'd to him, tho' theſe Petitions, or Petitioners, are *introduc'd* by his Son, who can only be conſider'd as the *Medium* by which they are convey'd to the Soveraign. And if there be any Parallel in this Caſe, it plainly proves that God alone is the *Object* of divine Worſhip; and Chriſt,

as Mediator, the *Way* by whom we have Access to God, our Prayers and Services presented to him, and render'd acceptable for his sake.

But then further, as this glorious Mediator is God as well as Man, if we abstract his Godhead from his humane Nature, he must be regarded as the *ultimate Object* of our Faith, Love, Prayer, and Praises, as being the natural and co-essential Son of his eternal Father, and one with him in Glory, Dignity, and Duration, and so equally worthy of our Honour and Homage: Yet still, as he voluntarily became a Mediator, he is by that Institution, or gracious Dispensation, *subordinate* to the Father; and in the Discharge of this *Office*, he brings us to God the Father, Himself, and the Holy Ghost, as one God blessed for ever, in whom all our Happiness consists, and our Adoration and Services finally terminate. And really this must yield a pleasing and endearing Thought, and vast Encouragement, to come unto God by such a Mediator, who is the Medium of our Addresses to the supreme Being, as vested with this Office, and at the same time, in his *highest Character*, the ultimate Object of Worship, as one with the Father; for the Dignity of his Godhead must stamp a prevailing *Efficacy* on the Pleas of his Blood, and give never-failing *Success* to his Intercession for us. So that however some may imagine, that our Lord's interceding with the Father may be inconsistent with his being God over all, if the high Nature and Prevalency of his Intercession was duly consider'd, I am apt to think it would appear an Act of Power and Authority *incongruous* to suppose any Creature should exercise; for it can never be thought, with any Reason, that the supreme Being should give a Creature *Authority over* himself; it looks too much like a Debasement of his Majesty, and a Reproach to his infinite Wisdom, as if God did not *better* know how to *dispose* of his Grace and Mercy, than any Creature does; and yet we find in Scripture, that our Lord Jesus Christ

hath

hath the Diſpoſal *of all* that the Father hath: Hence we read of his pleading with incontroulable Authority and Majeſty, *Father, I will that they alſo whom thou haſt given me be with me.** Is not this rather like the Language of one co-equal than inferior? Upon the whole then, Chriſt, *as God*, is the ultimate Object of Worſhip; but as *condeſcending* to be Mediator, and in order to attain the Ends of divine Love, becoming alſo *Man*, he is in this *complex* Character conſider'd only as the Medium of our Prayers, *&c.* which we don't direct immediately to him, but aſk the Father in his Name, which is paying no Worſhip to the Son as Mediator.

Secondly, *When we offer up our Prayers directly to Chriſt, we are* (ſays the Author) *to conſider him only as Mediator.*

Let us then conſider what he urges to prove this Aſſertion, and inſtead of producing any Precedent or Example of any ſuch Prayer offer'd to Chriſt as Mediator, he only alledges thoſe Texts, wherein he gueſſes the true Reaſon of Chriſt's being worſhip'd, *is his receiving his Authority and Right to Worſhip from the Father as a Gift.* The firſt Text he cites, is *John* v. 22, 23. *For the Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son, that all Men ſhould honour the Son as they honour the Father.* The Author here remarks, *'tis not ſaid that all Men ſhould honour the Son, becauſe he is equal to the Father.* But tho' this is not expreſly mention'd in this Verſe, 'tis plainly *imply'd*, and the whole *Streſs* of our Lord's Reaſoning in the *Context* depends on it. The *Jews*, as has been ſhewn, charg'd him with making himſelf equal to God, which he does not deny, wave, or explain, ſo as to make them think otherwiſe, but goes on to ſhew how he was equal to God, conſiſtent with his preſent Appearance, by demonſtrating that he did the ſame Works, had the ſame Knowledge, and the ſame Will; and conſequently, was

 worthy

* John xvii. 24.

worthy of the ſame Honour. So that theſe Words, *That all Men ſhould honour the Son as they do the Father*, does not refer to the preceding Verſe (thus Dr. *Clark*'s Paraphraſe, *all which things plainly ſhew)* but is the *Concluſion* of ſeveral Arguments he had advanc'd to prove his Equality with the Father; and if the Force of the *Greek* Particle γὰρ, in the foregoing Verſe, is truly weigh'd, *For all Judgment is committed to the Son*, it will appear that the *Equality* of the Son with the Father is the *Reaſon* of his committing all Judgment to him; and conſequently, of the *Honour* that is due unto him.* Whence 'tis obvious, that theſe Words, *that ye might honour the Son*, &c. having no immediate Reference to the former Verſe, they are foreign to his Purpoſe. And if I ſhould recede from this genuine Interpretation, to gratify him a little, he would not hereby *gain* his Point; for ſuppoſing the Father's *committing all Judgment* to the Son be aſſign'd as one Reaſon of our worſhiping him, it can be no more than as a *powerful prevailing Motive*; he being our Lord and Saviour, the Thoughts of what he has done for us muſt mightily *affect* our Souls, and lead us unavoidably, if there be *any* Conſtraints in Love, to expreſs the moſt grateful and honourable Conceptions of him poſſible. So that the Father might well command us not to forget our Obligations to his Son; for as the Conſideration of God, under the Character of our Creator, Preſerver, and Benefactor, is a ſtrong Inducement to worſhip and adore him, who, beſides this Relation, as he is the firſt Cauſe of ſupreme Dignity, and infinite in all Perfections, is worthy of all Honours, the true Foundation of all Worſhip; ſo our Lord, being *inveſted* with the Office of Mediator, puts a *new Tie* upon us to

* Intelligunt autem Hilarius, Chryſoſtomus, & Theophilactus patrem dediſſe filio omne judicium, gignendo Eum æqualem, & dando Ei ab æterno naturam divinam: cujus attributum proprium eſt judicare omnia. *Chemnit. in loc.*

to honour and worſhip the great God our Saviour, as will diſtinctly be prov'd. In the mean while, ſhould I allow the Author's Conſtruction to be juſt, I ſhould ſplit him upon a moſt palpable Contradiction; for he expreſly aſſerts, *'tis undoubtedly true, that the eſſential Dignity of Chriſt's Perſon is the Ground and Foundation of Honour and Eſteem, ſince we ought to eſteem and honour every Perſon in proportion to his Excellency.**

Now let the Reader take notice, if Chriſt's *eſſential Dignity be the Ground and Foundation of his Honour*, as he is in this Text before us commanded to be *honour'd* even as the Father, his Dignity muſt be *equal* to his Father's; and conſequently, the Honour paid to Chriſt is not, becauſe God hath *committed all Judgment to him*, as the Author aſſerts, *p.* 41, but merely upon the Account of his *eſſential Dignity*, as he very juſtly aſſerts, *p.* 43. one of which he muſt *retract*, in Juſtice to himſelf, and for the Honour of his Hypotheſis, which can't be ſupported by ſuch a Method. Having thus opened the Way to the Enquiry whether Chriſt is to be worſhiped as Mediator, *or as receiving Power from his Father merely by Gift*, I ſhall endeavour to demonſtrate the contrary by the following Arguments; and if I ſucceed in this Undertaking, by the Author's own Conceſſion † the Controverſy is at a Period. In order to which I ſhall ſhew,

Firſt, That no *derived Authority* can be the proper and formal Reaſon of paying that Honour or Worſhip, or any part of it, to him to whom it is *delegated*, which is peculiar to the ſupreme Being alone.

Secondly, Tho' Chriſt, who is our Mediator, is to be worſhip'd, and the *Benefits* of his redeeming Love are ſtrong Inducements to adore him in that Character and Relation to us; yet, was he not *alſo God over all*, one with his eternal Father, no Motive could *incite* us to give

* Unity, p. 43. † Reply, p. 26.

him any *Share* of that Glory that is due to the ſupreme Being; and conſequently, he is not to be worſhip'd as Mediator, *i. e. as receiving Power and Authority by the Father's Gift.*

Thirdly, Divine Honour was *due*, and Worſhip actually *paid* to Chriſt, before God the Father made him Lord, according to the Author's Hypotheſis; and conſequently, he is not to be worſhip'd as Mediator, unleſs it was paid to him without his having *any Claim* or Right to it, which can't be ſuppos'd.

Fourthly, Divine Honours and Worſhip will be render'd to our Lord Redeemer after the *Surrender* of his mediatorial Kingdom to the Father; and conſequently, he is not to be worſhip'd as Mediator, or *as receiving Power from the Father*; for when his Mediation *ceaſes*, which gave Title to the Worſhip paid him, that muſt *neceſſarily* ceaſe alſo.

Fifthly, The Mediation of Chriſt having reſpect to the humane Nature, if he is worſhip'd only as *veſted* in this Office, it will make that, at leaſt, in part, the Ground and Reaſon, as well as the *Object* of divine Worſhip; which can't be admitted, without introducing two Objects of Worſhip, and the Hazard of worſhiping the Creature, *&c.*

1*ſt*, I am to prove, that no deriv'd Authority can be the proper and *formal* Reaſon of paying that Honour or religious Worſhip, or any part of it, to him to whom it is delegated, which is *peculiar* to the ſupreme Being.

That all divine religious Worſhip is peculiarly appropriated to the ſupreme Being, and is his *incommunicable* Due from every rational Being, the inſpired Writings with the utmoſt Force and Perſpicuity demonſtrate, and both Jews and Chriſtians unanimouſly concur in; as Dr. *Waterland* has evinc'd with admirable and irreſiſtible Argument †: So that I need not enter upon that Field, eſpecially,

† Query 16.

eſpecially, conſidering that not only the *Teſtimony* of God concerning Himſelf, and the general Senſe of his true Worſhipers, both under the old and the new Diſpenſation, make it plain, but the very Nature of divine Worſhip itſelf evidently ſuppoſes it: For, when in my very Heart I adore, and with my *inmoſt* Soul revere and honour, or with my Mouth ſincerely aſcribe all Glory to God, I thereby acknowledge his infinite Perfections and independent Excellencies: When I praiſe him for my Breath and Being, for the Mercies he has *already* beſtow'd, or for the *Hopes* of what he has promis'd, I acknowledge him to be the Fountain of all Goodneſs, the firſt Cauſe, the only Author of Life and Happineſs: When with Patience I *ſubmit* to his Will, and *chearfully* reſign up my All to his Conduct, I thereby acknowledge his ſovereign Power and infinite Wiſdom, one from whom I *deriv'd* every Enjoyment, and to whoſe Faithfulneſs and Care I *commit* the Diſpoſal of myſelf and all my temporal and ſpiritual Concerns. All which is nothing elſe but *an active* Declaration of his adorable *Majeſty*, of the Truth, Wiſdom, Goodneſs, and other glorious Perfections of the moſt high God; as the Heavens, by their beautiful Silence and *elegant* Order, *paſſively* declare his Being, Glory, and Perfections. Such a high Eſteem then, and Admiration of the ſupreme Being, as leads me to *bow down* my Soul before him, to acknowledge his Excellencies, depend upon his almighty Power, to invoke him in all my Straits and Neceſſities, together with all thoſe external and humble Geſtures, whereby I teſtify this *inward Veneration*, belongs to none but God; for *every Act* of religious Worſhip, our Faith, Love, Truſt, Obedience, Prayer, and Praiſe, præ-ſuppoſes the Object to be infinite in all Perfections: It muſt ſuppoſe him to be *omniſcient*, to know our particular Caſes, the firſt Motions of our Souls, and all the ſecret Workings of our Hearts, or elſe he could not know whether we worſhiped him or no, or judge of our Sincerity therein: It muſt ſuppoſe him to

be

be *omnipreſent*, to be with us in our moſt cloſe Retirements; and, where-ever two or three, or more, are met together, to behold the Homage we pay unto him, and all thoſe ſpiritual Sacrifices of Prayer and Praiſe we offer up: It muſt alſo ſuppoſe him to be *omnipotent*, *all-ſufficient*, *ſelf-ſufficient*, one that can help us in all Times of Need, that is able to ſupply all our Wants, that can of himſelf, and from himſelf, at all times furniſh us with all Mercies, being the Spring and Source of them. So that the true and only Ground of rendring divine Worſhip to any Being, is the *Excellency and unlimited Perfections of its divine Nature*; and as all theſe glorious Perfections are proper to the only true and living God, that divine Worſhip, Honour, and Allegiance that is *founded* hereon, can't be communicated to an inferiour Being, unleſs the *Perfections* of the divine Nature be communicated alſo; but as none of theſe Perfections, as they are in God infinite and *unlimited*, can by any kind of Delegation be made over to any one, who is not *eſſentially* God (unleſs divine eſſential Perfections be transfus'd into him, whereby he would ceaſe to be a Creature, and ſo there be two Gods infinite in Perfection, which would be a Contradiction) none can ſhare in that Glory and Adoration, Worſhip and Obedience, that is his peculiar Due; for ſeeing the formal Reaſon (which is that Principle which makes a thing to be what it is, and to be one in itſelf, and diſtinct from all others, which it is not); I ſay, ſeeing the formal Reaſon of divine Worſhip is the *Godhead*, and this principal Foundation of Worſhip being neceſſarily one, as the Godhead is one, to think that the ſupreme Being ſhould *command* Honour to be given, which is only due and proper to himſelf, to one that is not God, is utterly *impoſſible*, and a flat Abſurdity. So that all other Gods, Demons, Images, and lower Beings whatever, are everlaſtingly excluded from all our divine Worſhip. Suppoſing then that Chriſt hath a *borrow'd* Excellency and Dignity or Power, which he receiv'd, as an *in-*

ferior

ferior Agent, from the Father, by way of Delegation; this Excellency and Power, whatever it be, is distinct from, and, by the Author's Scheme, inferior to the Father's, which is original, infinite, and supreme; consequently it can't be the formal Cause of divine Worship, that being *peculiar to the supreme Being* alone; so that 'twould be no less than *Idolatry* to worship Christ as an inferiour Being, which is giving that Glory to another which is due to God alone; and which, in his Jealousy for his own Honour, he hath solemnly protested against, saying, *How should my Name be polluted? I will not give my Glory to another* *. 'Tis no easy matter, by an *unscriptural* Distinction of a supreme and subordinate God, and *supreme and relative inferior Worship*, to elude the Force of this Argument; for there is but one Foundation of divine Worship, the divine Nature and Perfections: And supposing Christ not fully possess'd of Godhead, if our Author and his Friends would act consistent with their Principle, they shou'd deny all religious Worship to our Lord; for upon any other Footing 'tis impossible to be defended, as *Francken* demonstrated in his Dispute with *Socinus*. This Gentleman himself was a Socinian, and as he believed that Christ was not God equal to the Father, he refused to pay him any religious Worship at all. *Socinus*, on the contrary, press'd with those Texts that expressly command Honour and Worship to be render'd to the Son of God, and the many Instances of it in Scripture, pleaded for it; but how miserably he was *crampt* by the Arguments of his Adversary, will appear by the following Example. *Francken*, aiming to prove it Idolatry to worship one who was not the supreme Being, advanc'd this Argument; *viz.* "As great a Distance as there is be-
" tween the Creator and the Creature, so great ought
" the *Difference* to be between the Honour that is exhi-
" bited

* Isaiah xlviii. 11. xlii. 8.

" bited to the one and the other; but between the Cre-
" ator and the Creature *there is the greateſt* Difference,
" whether you reſpect Nature and Eſſence, or Dignity
" and Excellency; and therefore there ought to be the
" greateſt Difference between the Honour of the Creator
" and the Creature; but the Honour that chiefly is due
" to God is religious Worſhip; therefore this is not to
" be given to a Creature, therefore not to Chriſt, whom
" you confeſs to be a mere Creature." Which way of Reaſoning ſo pinch'd *Socinus*, that he was forc'd to fly to the moſt wretched Shifts to evade the Edge of it; and, when reduc'd to his *Ne plus ultra*, he is forc'd to cry out, " I am as certain of the Truth of my Opinion, as I am " that I hold this Hat in my Hand; which is a way of " arguing that is commonly us'd by Men that have no-" thing elſe to ſay." Which made *Francken* laugh at him, and tell him, " Your Certainty cannot be a Rule of " Truth to me and others, ſeeing another Man may be " found that will ſay, He is moſt certain of the contrary " Opinion." † Perhaps our Author is as certain as *Socinus*; but when he can ſhew that one, who is not equal to God, can be the Object of divine Worſhip, he will be apt to procure Diſciples. But I apprehend, as there is no Proportion between God and that which is below him, neither in Being nor Excellency, whatever is not equal to him, will be found infinitely inferiour, and ſo not a capable Object of Worſhip. And this may be demonſtrated, ſeeing there is no *Scale* of Being between the great Creator and his Creatures, and conſequently no *Degrees* of Compariſon, which will only hold between Creature and Creature.

2*dly*, Tho' Chriſt, *who is Mediator*, is to be worſhip'd, and the Benefits of his redeeming Love are ſtrong Inducements to adore him *in that Character* and Relation to

† *Owen* againſt *Biddle*, p. 425, 426.

to us; yet was he not also *God* over all, one with his eternal Father, no Motive could incite us to give him any *Share* of that Glory that is due to the supreme Being alone; and consequently he is not to be worship'd as Mediator, *i. e. as receiving Power and Authority by the Father's Gift.*

Our Mediator, the Lord Jesus Christ, *who is the Son of God*, having assum'd the *compleat* Nature of Man into an hypostatical, or personal Union with himself, not by Confusion, or Mixture of the divine and humane Nature together, but by an ineffable, but real Unity of Person, the humane Nature has no proper Subsistence of its own; and consequently the Person of the Mediator, being the second and adorable Person of the Trinity, possesses all the Titles and Perfections of Godhead: And so we are indispensably bound to worship him as God, the ultimate Object of our Faith, Hope, and Trust &c. being of the same undivided Nature as his Father. And as the Church *militant* adore, call upon him, believe in him, and commit their all to him; so the Church *triumphant* ascribe unto him all divine Perfections, and everlasting Praises: *I beheld* (says the loving Apostle *John*) * *and I heard the Voice of many Angels round about the Throne, and the Beasts and the Elders, and the Number of them was ten Thousand times ten Thousand, and Thousands of Thousands, saying with a loud Voice, worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive Power and Riches, Wisdom and Strength, and Honour, and Glory, and Blessing.* In these lofty *Strains* of Adoration the *Lamb* is here the Object of divine Worship, and 'tis said, he is *worthy* of it; which plainly points to his intrinsick Excellency, as God, as well as alludes to those Obligations which in the new Character of Redeemer he has laid on his Church; for, v. 13. every Creature is represented

* Rev. v. 11.

ſented as paying the ſame ſolemn ſupreme Homage both to the Father and Son: *Bleſſing, Honour, and Glory, and Power, be unto him that ſitteth on the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.* So *Rev.* 7. 10. *&c.* a numberleſs Throng of adoring Spirits with united Hearts and Voices are brought in praiſing God and the Lamb, without the leaſt Appearance of *different* Degrees of Worſhip: And can we think the ſame Language, the ſame Addreſſes, the ſame Songs of Praiſe, the ſame noble, *high-rais'd* Acts of Devotion are due to God, and one that *borrows* all his Excellencies? But our Author leaps over all theſe Conſiderations, and is ſo forward, as to aſſert, that the Worſhip here paid to Chriſt is what is due to him as Mediator: * But his Miſtake lies in this, that becauſe the Perſon here characteris'd by the ſlain Lamb was the Mediator, he concludes he muſt be worſhip'd as Mediator *only, or as receiving Power from the Father.* But this by no means follows; for tho' (as I have ſhewn) the Godhead be the only Foundation of divine Worſhip, yet the vaſt and glorious Benefits that we partake of, by the Mediation of Jeſus, are inviolable Motives on our Souls to worſhip the Son of God in the Character of Mediator, and as ſuch the Scriptures aſſign them; *as moving Reaſons of it*; and they, whoſe Hearts are not deeply affected with the Love of Chriſt, can never believe in him, or pay any Homage to him with a becoming Fervour. *I live* (ſaith the Apoſtle) *by the Faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himſelf for me.* A thankful Remembrance of what the dear Redeemer has done for us, a Senſe of his *inexpreſſible* Love, which was the *Spring* of all his Sufferings and glorious Attempts for us; and due Thoughts of the Mercy, Grace, Peace, and Glory which he hath *procured* thereby, are the great and unconquerable Motives to fix our Confidence and Affiance in him; all

* Unity, *p.* 42.

all the rational Powers and Faculties being ſtrongly influenc'd and mov'd thus to act by a Reflection on the *Wonders* of redeeming Grace. And this, I conceive, is not very diſagreeable to the Author's own Sentiments, tho' he would ſeem to differ; for, *p.* 43. he tells us, *The abſolute Dignity of the Father himſelf does not appear to be the only Foundation of our Duty to pray to and thank him.* The Reaſon he gives is, *No one would be obliged to pray to him, unleſs he exerciſed a Providence over the World;* ——*for if God did not, and would not give, he could have no Encouragement to ask.* Here, 'tis plain, the Author ſets up *two* Foundations of Prayer; *Firſt*, The abſolute *Dignity* of the Father: But *this is not the only Foundation*; and therefore, *Secondly*, His *exerciſing a Providence over the World is another.* The firſt Foundation, *viz.* the *Dignity of God*, I have prov'd is the true, *only*, and formal Reaſon or Foundation of Worſhip. The ſecond Foundation, as the Author calls it, I term more juſtly the *Motive* of our Addreſſes. As we have a Senſe of our Dependance on God, our Obligations to him, and his Readineſs and Ability to hear and help us, we are induc'd to ask what we want; for if I knew he would turn a *deaf* Ear to my Prayer, or had not *Power* to relieve me, I could have no *Motive* to ſupplicate his Favour: And indeed Mankind are immediately acted, for the moſt part, by *feeling* their Wants which they have, and by a *Deſire* of the Happineſs they have not; and therefore what our dear Lord *did for us*, is firſt propos'd to lead us to conſider *what he is*, and ſo to frame ourſelves accordingly.* Inſtead then of the formal Reaſon of Worſhip, let us put the *primary Foundation*; and inſtead of the moving Reaſons to pleaſe our Author, let us put the *ſecondary Foundation*, or the next immediate *Reaſon* of worſhiping the Redeemer, and 'twill amount to near the ſame. So that inſtead of confuting

* Phil. ii. 5, 6, 7, &c. iii. 8, 9, 10, 11.

confuting Dr. *Waterland*'s Distinction of the Grounds of Worship, *viz.* " *The essential Dignity* of Christ's Person " as God, which is the real Foundation of all Honour, " and his Offices relative to us as the moving Reason, " which principally affect our Wills, and strongly in- " cite us to pay it accordingly;" he does but confirm the Notion, tho' in other *Phrases* that carry the same Ideas; and I am satisfied by all his Struggles he can't get over it; for how does he double and twist the more to *entangle* himself in his *Reply!* † where he confounds the Foundation and Motive of Worship together in such a manner, as to leave room for making what he pleases the Foundation of our Worship; for if the Foundation and Motive of Worship are the same thing, 'tis certain *one Man* may have a Motive to excite him to worship God, which *another* has not, and so may have a *different Foundation* for his Worship; which shews, that the Foundation and Motive of Worship are two things; nay, the Author himself, tho' he disallows of the Doctor's Distinction, assigns one not much unlike it. * *Christ's Dominion over us is the Foundation of our worshiping him, or is that which gives him a Title to it; and the very same Dominion, actually exercis'd in doing us good, is the Motive to pray to and thank him.* How can the Foundation and Motive then be the same? The *Dominion*, 'tis true, is the same; but if not *exercis'd*, there might be a *Title* to worship where there was *no Motive:* So that for all he has advanc'd against the Doctor's *Distinction*, it stands firm and immoveable. Agreeable hereunto, when we worship our Lord Jesus according to the *primary* Foundation, *viz.* the *Dignity* of his Person, we offer him the *same entire* Worship we pay to the Father, which is not mix'd according to the Natures of Christ, but purely *divine*; and therefore is not founded upon any *temporary* Office, Service,

† Page 43. * Unity, p. 44.

vice, or Benefit, nor any external Denomination or Relation, but upon his *infinite Excellency*, his eternal Godhead. Again, when we are led to invocate or adore Him who is our Mediator by the *second Foundation*, (to accommodate myself to the Author's Way of thinking) the surprizing and admirable Benefits we receive *by his Mediation*, are excellent and forcible Motives to excite us to give that divine Worship to our Lord, *in that Relation*; which is only *properly* due unto him for his *own* infinite Perfections. This is intimated to us, *Rev.* xv. *6. To him that loved us, and wash'd us from our Sins in his own Blood, and hath made us Kings and Priests to God, and his Father; to him be Glory and Dominion for ever.* What ingenuous Mind would not love him for this? Who would not adore and admire him who hath done such *marvelous* things for us? The Thoughts of the glorious and amazing Effects of our Saviour's Mediation should be as so many *Chains* to bind us down to Gratitude, Adoration, and Obedience; as every Instance of God's Mercy towards us shou'd be *a Motive* to our Worship and Praise, tho' 'tis not the *primary* Foundation; and thus God himself tells us, *Exod.* xx. 2, 3. *I am the Lord thy God, which brought thee out of the Land of* Egypt, *out of the House of Bondage: Thou shalt have no other Gods but me.——Thou shalt not bow down thy self to them, nor serve them.* The loving Kindness of God, in delivering his People from *Egyptian* Thraldom, is here offer'd as a moving Reason of worshiping him alone, but not as the formal Cause of it; for the worshiping of the one God is an eternal, indispensable, and *moral Precept*, not to be chang'd; and this Homage and Worship was due *only* to God from the Children of *Israel*, tho' he had *never* brought them out of *Egypt*; yet it must be own'd, that a Sense of divine Goodness upon all grateful Minds is a strong *Engagement* to Worship and Praise; it strikes upon the Soul with irresistible Energy, and effectually constrains; and therefore God's delivering his People is here *propos'd* as a Motive to their worshiping

him: Whence it was, that *Moſes* and the ranſom'd *Captives* thus ſang in Commemoration of God's Power and Goodneſs, in the Overthrow of *Pharaoh*, and their final Freedom from his Yoke: * *Who is like unto thee, O Lord, among the Gods! who is like thee, glorious in Holineſs, fearful in Praiſes, doing Wonders!* And, in ſhort, without giving any more Inſtances of this Nature, all the rich Diſplays of God's Power, Wiſdom, and Love, in *creating*, *governing*, and *redeeming* a loſt World, are invincible Arguments to preſs us to pay our Fealty and Allegiance to him, as the Sovereign King and Lord, who is of infinite Eminency, which all theſe *tranſcendent Acts* of Power, Wiſdom, and Goodneſs do manifeſt. Hence the holy Pſalmiſt often breaks out in the ſweeteſt Strains of Praiſe: *Bleſs the Lord, O my Soul, for all his Benefits; and all that is within me bleſs his holy Name*, &c. Thus it is exactly in the Caſe before us; the Benefits, that *reſult* from our Lord's Mediation, are indiſpenſable *Obligations* on us to render him all Glory and Praiſe; but his Mediation is not the *original* Ground and Foundation of this Worſhip, but only a ſtrong, effectual, and endearing *Motive* hereunto; ſo that however dignified and exalted Chriſt be in the *Office* of Mediator, and how vaſt ſoever the Bleſſings are that *accrue* to us hereby, yet if not by Nature God, and poſſeſs'd of all Perfections and Excellencies, we ought not to pay any *divine* Worſhip to him. Whence it remains as an *undoubted* Truth, that Chriſt's mediatory Office, his Sufferings, or his Glories, as God-Man, cannot be the *prime* Foundation of divine Worſhip; becauſe, the formal and proper Reaſon of the Worſhip due and given to him, is the *divine Nature* and infinite Excellency of our Mediator, which alone is of it ſelf, and for it ſelf, capable of divine Worſhip, which is an *Acknowledgment* that we aſcribe to the *Being* we thus honour all divine Perfections,

* Exod. xv. 11.

tions, such as Omnipotence, Omniscience, infinite Goodness, Omnipresence, All-sufficiency, &c. And since we are oblig'd *to honour the Son as we honour the Father*, he must be, in all divine Excellencies, *equal* to the Father, and with him and the Holy Ghost the *ultimate Object* of Worship.

3*dly*, Divine Honour was *due*, and Worship actually *paid* to Christ, before God the Father *made him Lord*, according to the Author's Hypothesis; and consequently he is not to be worship'd as Mediator, unless it was paid to him without his having *any Claim* or Right to it, which can't *easily* be suppos'd.

The Author * acquaints us, *That Jesus was not essentially Lord, but was made such by the Father, as the Apostle testifies*, Act. ii. 36. which compar'd with *v.* 33. and with *Phil.* ii. 9, 10, 11. cited by him in the former Page, 'tis evident his Meaning is, *that Christ's Title to Worship is founded entirely on the Powers given him at his Exaltation.* If I can therefore prove that he had a just Claim to Worship *antecedent* to this, and was actually worshiped before any *such Authority* at this time was *delegated* to him, 'twill be a Demonstration that our Lord's Right to our religious Homage and Adoration does not *depend* upon his Office: And let but the Reader now turn to *Heb.* i. 6. and he will easily perceive, that Christ is to be worshiped as soon as manifested to the World: *When he bringeth in his first-begotten into the World, he saith, And let all the Angels of God worship him:* The very Angels of God, who are not properly the *Subjects* of Christ's mediatorial Kingdom, and whose Powers were not immediately receiv'd for their sakes, are here *commanded* to do him divine Homage, which is doubtless that *natural* Worship which they owe to him *as God*, and which they are now particularly commanded to pay in an august solemn manner, in Testi-

* Unity, *p.* 42.

mony of the Glory of divine Grace, and all those other Perfections of the Godhead which were display'd in our Lord's Incarnation, to celebrate, in the highest Strains, the Praises of the Redeemer of the World, just as they are represented, singing Anthems of Joy at our Creation, *to express* the Power and Glory of the Creator. And that the Deity of Christ was the primary Foundation of this angelical Worship is from hence evident, that God the Father calls his Son by *a Title* expressive of it, saying, *v.* 8. *To the Son thy Throne, O God, is for ever and ever*; and that this Phrase denotes his eternal Existence, as well *à parte ante*, as *à parte post*, is manifest, *v.* 10. *And thou, Lord, in the beginning, hast laid the Foundation of the Earth; and the Heavens are the Works of thine Hands. They shall perish, but thou remainest, and they all shall wax old as doth a Garment. And as a Vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be chang'd; but thou art the same, and thy Years fail not.*—In this Verse our Saviour's Eternity, Omnipotence, Immutability, Sovereignty, and Dominion over all, as the *great Creator*, is plainly taught; upon which Account he is, with the Father, *&c.* the ultimate Object of Worship, as is obvious, *Rev.* i. 4. *Fear God, and give Glory to him, for the Hour of his Judgment is come; and worship him that made Heaven and Earth, and the Sea, and the Fountains of Waters*; so that divine Honour was due to our blessed Lord *before* his Incarnation, his Passion, or Resurrection, as God Creator, Sustainer, and Governour of the World from the Beginning; and as he had a Right to it, if it appears farther, that he was *actually* worship'd but one Day before his Exaltation, it entirely destroys our Author's fine Structure, and plucks it up by the Roots. And how many Instances might be produc'd of his being worship'd even before his Death? let one suffice, *Mat.* xiv. 33. *Then they that were in the Ship came and worship'd him, saying, of a Truth thou art the Son of God*: From hence 'tis certain, that Worship was actually paid to our blessed Lord before his Exaltation; and consequently,

quently, his being *then* invested with the Office of Mediator, could not give him a Title to it, unless Worship was render'd to the Saviour before he deserv'd it, and in Justice had no manner of Claim or Right to it, any more than another Man; which, I presume, none can well imagine. So that, when 'tis said, *Phil.* ii. 9, 10. *Wherefore God hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name which is above every Name; that at the Name of Jesus every Knee shall bow*, &c. this can't be understood of any *new Glory* that was added to the Son of God by his Exaltation, but only that hereby his *original* Glory, as God, was made more illustrious in regard of Manifestation; which is as plain as Words can make it, *Rom.* i. 4. and *declared to be the Son of God with Power, according to the Spirit of Holiness, by the Resurrection from the dead.* By this stupendious Act of Power, which is attributed to him as well as the Father, he demonstrated his *Conquest* over Death and Hell, and all the Powers of Darkness, and more signally display'd not only the *Trophies* of his Cross, and the *Glories* of his Godhead, but at the same time, as by the *Price* of his Blood he had purchas'd our Ransom and Salvation, he became *Lord over us* in a peculiar manner, even as he had *bought* us; whereby he is invested with a new Title of Redeemer, and a new *Relation* to his Creatures, tho' without any new Acquests of Glory to himself, as God; according to his own Words, *Father, glorify me with thine own self, with the Glory which I had with thee before the World was.* So that now the Son of God is not only our Lord by *Creation*, but by *Redemption* also; which is a convincing Proof, that had not our Mediator been *God* as well as Man, he could never have thus purchas'd us, and so become our *absolute* Lord as well as Saviour: * For I dare say, none can pretend to prove how the *Rights* of Deity cou'd be

* Rom. xiv. 7, 8, 9.

preſerv'd entire and inviolable, if we ſhou'd become the abſolute Property and Servants of any but God, to whom alone we owe our ſelves and our All; for, by all the Laws and Rules of Right and Equity, the captive Slave owes all his Services and Obedience to him that purchaſes his Deliverance and his Services; and it holds true in this Caſe, *for we are bought with a Price*, and therefore *are not our own*, but his who hath bought us, * and him are we bound to ſerve *with our Souls and Bodies, which are his*: By this glorious and free Purchaſe of us, the Redeemer is become our abſolute, ſovereign, only, Lord, unto whom we owe all religious Subjection of Soul and Conſcience; for he is Lord *over his own* Houſe, even he that *made all things, who is God.* †

4*thly*, Divine Honours and Worſhip will be render'd to our Lord Redeemer, after the *Surrender* of his mediatorial Kingdom to the Father; and conſequently he is not to be worſhip'd as Mediator, *or as receiving Powers from the Father*; for when his Mediation *ceaſes*, which gave Title to the Worſhip paid him, that muſt *neceſſarily* ceaſe alſo.

Nothing can be more expreſs, than that Glory for ever and ever is to be aſcribed to Chriſt, 2 *Pet.* ii. 18. *But grow in Grace and in the Knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, to him be Glory both now and for ever*, Amen. So *Rev.* i. 6. *To him be Glory and Dominion for ever and ever*, Amen. Again, *Rev.* v. 13. *Bleſſing, and Honour, and Glory, and Power, be unto him that ſitteth upon the Throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.* Here God and the Lamb are jointly praiſed; and 'tis worthy of Remark, that the very ſame *Doxology*, which is frequently given to Chriſt, *viz. to whom be Glory for ever*, is aſcribed to God the Father §, which doubtleſs are Marks of that *ſupreme* Adoration proper to the *true* God; and what poſſible

* 1 Cor. vi. 19, 20. † Heb. iii 4. § Gal. i. 5, &c.

poſſible Reaſon can be aſſign'd, why Worſhip of the ſame *Kind and Strain, and eternal Duration*, ſhould be aſcribed to our Lord Jeſus, if he was not one in Eſſence, Power, Majeſty, and Glory, with his Father? The Kingdom which is adminiſtred by Chriſt, as Mediator, is temporary and changeable; and when he hath accompliſh'd the great Deſign *for which* he undertook this royal Office, he will reſign his diſpenſatory Kingdom, and thereby declare that he was ſubject to the Father *whilſt he* ſuſtain'd his mediatory Office, 1 *Cor.* xv. 28. *And when all things ſhall be ſubdu'd unto him, then ſhall the Son alſo himſelf be ſubject unto him, that put all things under him, that God may be all in all*,—i. e. when Chriſt, who is the Son of God, ſhall have ſubdu'd all his Enemies, gain'd a complete Conqueſt over Sin, Death, and Hell, wicked Angels, and wicked Men, and perfectly conſummated the Meaſures of his Wiſdom and Grace, his *mediatorial Government* ſhall ceaſe, that God may for ever be the immediate Governour, Lord, and Diſpoſer of all Bleſſings, without the Intervention of his Mediation; and that our Worſhip be tender'd directly to God, and our Happineſs be deriv'd immediately from him, when in Heaven, without *any Pleas* of our Advocate to introduce us to the divine Preſence, or procure the divine Favour. So that now God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, will be all in all, the Object of all Worſhip, the Fountain of all Joy; and that this Phraſe, *that God may be all in all*, comprehends the three Perſons, is evident, not only from this, that the Apoſtle does not mention the *Father*, as in *v.* 24. but *God ſhall become all in all*; "which "ſeems to lead us to that Interpretation of the Godhead "which comprehends Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt;" as Dr. *Whitby*, † whom the Author thinks to be one of the greateſt Men in the Learned World, obſerves. But this

† Annot. upon the Place.

Interpretation, I conceive, may be grounded on those Words, *Then shall the Son also himself be subject*, τότε, at *that time*, ὅταν, *when* all things *shall be subdu'd unto him*; which supposes, that before his Entrance upon his mediatorial Kingdom, he was not *subject* to the Father; but tho' he was God, and *counted it no Robbery to be equal with God*, yet, as he also in the *Fulness of Time died for our Sins, and rose again for our Justification*, and so was invested with a Commission, in the Discharge of this *high Office* he was subject, which shall *at last* appear more clearly in the *surrendring* of his Kingdom to him *who put all things under him*; for his delivering it up will be an Argument, that he *receiv'd* it by Delegation, which is a Mark of Subjection; so that tho' all things shall be subdu'd by the Son, yet 'twill then be manifest that he himself was also subject to his Father, because he acted in the Character of God-Man. That this is the genuine Construction of the Words, is clear from this, That if this Expression, *Then shall the Son himself be subject*, means any thing more but his *ceasing* from the Administration of the mediatorial Kingdom, wherein the *human Nature* is in some respect a Sharer; it would prove, that our Lord Jesus Christ is not *now* subject to his Father, as Mediator, which is contrary to the Scriptures, and the Confession of both Sides, and which I desire the Reader will consider. *Then shall the Son himself be subject*, i.e. give up his dispensatory Kingdom, and thereby *declare* and manifest his *Subjection* as Mediator, *that God may be all in all*, i. e. that Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, universal Monarch by Necessity of Nature, may reign with the same Majesty and Glory, without any Distinction, in all and over all to Everlasting; for what need now of the Office of a *Mediator*, to reconcile God and Man, who are made *compleat* and indissoluble Friends? Or what Necessity of a *Sanctifier* to renew deprav'd Souls, when all are now freed from the Taint of Sin, and without Spot or Wrinkle? And consequently, the Ends of our Lord's Office being

ing fully anſwer'd, and all the Method of Grace finiſh'd, his mediatory Kingdom has a final Period; and if it does thus ceaſe, 'tis a ſtrong and irrefragable Argument, when we read of Angels and glorified Saints worſhiping Chriſt for ever and ever, that the Title he has to their Homage can't be *founded* on his Office; for that *ceaſes*, and conſequently the Worſhip due upon that Account *muſt end* with it, unleſs he be thought a proper Object of Worſhip who hath no Claim to it, and who hath voluntarily relinquiſh'd his *Title* to it, by *reſigning* his Empire and Dominion which *firſt* gave it to him. So that if Chriſt is to be adored for ever and ever, his Right to our Worſhip is not to be fetch'd from his being intruſted with all Power and Authority, as Mediator, but from his divine Nature and Perfections, as being *equal to the Father*, and God bleſſed for ever; which is the primary Reaſon and Foundation of all religious Worſhip, as well as the ultimate Object of it; and the glorious Salvation he has purchas'd by aſſuming human Nature, and becoming a Sacrifice for Sin, *&c.* an everlaſting Motive to it. This Argument, which I have ſo largely proſecuted, Dr. *Waterland* had hinted in his Preface; and I perceive the Author, in his Reply, * takes ſome Notice of it; and, in order to elude it, he makes *Chriſt a Mediator for ever*, contrary to what the Apoſtle had ſo directly aſſerted, That he ſhould deliver up the *Kingdom to God at the end of the World*; and all that he grounds this extravagant and novel Opinion upon, is that Paſſage, *Rom.* xvi. 27. *To God, only wiſe, be Glory, through Jeſus Chriſt for ever*, Amen; where the Apoſtle only aſcribes eternal Glory to God, and adds, Through Jeſus Chriſt, to ſhew that our Praiſe and Thankſgiving is now *offer'd to*, and *accepted* of God thro' him, agreeable to *Epheſ.* iii. 21. *Unto him be Glory in the Church by Chriſt Jeſus, throughout all Ages, World without end*, Amen. And our Author himſelf, in the very

* *Page* 49.

very next Words, grants, that the mediatorial Office ſhall ceaſe ; if ſo, how can Chriſt be a Mediator for ever? His Words are, *When the mediatorial Office ſhall ceaſe, the Son is not to be exalted higher than before*, (alluding to 1 *Cor.* xv. 24, 25, explained above) *and if he is not to be worſhiped now as ſupreme God, he cannot be worſhiped as ſuch afterwards :* To which 'tis ſufficient briefly to reply, that as he is not *now* worſhiped as Mediator, but as ſupreme God, ſo he will be worſhiped and adored for evermore by Cherubims and Seraphims, and all the Spirits of the Juſt made perfect : To which glorious and happy Number I hope we ſhall both of us be one Day join'd, to bear our Parts in *unanimouſly* aſcribing, though we now differ about it, eternal Praiſes to God and the Lamb ; for as the *Effects* of his Mediation ſhall continue for ever, we ſhall ſtill have ſweet Inducements to praiſe our Redeemer, God, under the amiable Character of a ſlain Lamb, who has, by his Blood, purchaſed our Ranſom from Hell and Miſery, and put us in Poſſeſſion of everlaſting Bliſs.

5*thly*. The Mediation of Chriſt, having reſpect to the *humane Nature*, if he is worſhiped only as *veſted* in this Office, it will make that, at leaſt in Part, the *Ground* and Reaſon, as well as *Object* of divine Worſhip, which cannot be admitted without introducing *two Objects* of Worſhip, and the *Hazard* of worſhiping the Creature.

There are doubtleſs ſome Offices to be diſcharged by Chriſt as Mediator, which cannot be performed by him *as God*, becauſe they neceſſarily import *Subjection*, *Inferiority*, and *Dependance*. Thus, for Inſtance, in order to become a *Victim* for Sin, 'twas requiſite that he ſhould *ſhed his Blood* for a Ranſom ; and ſeeing the Deity was impaſſible, and uncapable of thoſe Submiſſions and Sufferings, which were neceſſary to expiate Guilt, infinite Stoop ! the Son of God condeſcended to aſſume our Nature, that he might die for our Offences ; and as

he

he thus became Man, *as such* he partook of our Paſſions, Infirmities, and Temptations, and hereby was feelingly *touch'd* with a tender Senſe of our Frailties and Weakneſſes; and ſo was the more ready and able to ſympathize with, and compaſſionately ſuccour us, according to the Word of the Apoſtle, *Heb.* ii. 17, 18. *Wherefore it behoved him in all things to be made like unto his Brethren, that he might be a merciful and a faithful High-Prieſt, in things pertaining to God, to make Reconciliation for the Sins of the People. For in that he himſelf hath ſuffer'd, being tempted, he is able to ſuccour them that are tempted.* Such an Advocate we needed, who might appear in the Preſence of God for us, and effectually plead in Heaven the Efficacy of his Blood for our Pardon and Reconciliation; and for all this the bleſſed Jeſus was thoroughly furniſhed: *For he needed not daily, as other High-Prieſts, to offer up Sacrifice, firſt for his own Sins, and then for the People's; for this he did once when he offered up himſelf.* † So that our dear Lord now only intercedes, that the ſaving Effects of his Death may be conveyed to them that believe in him, having *already* made the Atonement: And in all this it appears, *That he is an High-Prieſt called of God, as was* Aaron; *and, though a Son, yet learnt Obedience by the things which he ſuffered.* § He obeyed the Commands of his Father, and was his Servant, in carrying on the Deſigns of his Love; and in this reſpect *the Head of Chriſt is God*, 1 Cor. xi. 3. From whence 'tis obvious, that our Lord could not diſcharge the Office of a Mediator *in his higheſt Nature*; and as the *Word was made Fleſh* to accompliſh it, he has, as Mediator, a humane as well as divine Nature. Should we therefore worſhip our Lord as Mediator, we muſt worſhip the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus, as well as the *eternal Logos*, which would introduce *two Objects* of Worſhip; or at leaſt one, that has a double Title to our Adoration, whoſe

† Heb. vii. 27. § See Heb. v. 4, 8, 10.

whoſe Claims are *infinitely different*, and *ſubverſive* of each other, which would be a ſtrange Mixture, and a ſurprizing Stretch of Devotion, and, as Worſhip is due to God alone, muſt be *juſtly* chargeable with Idolatry: For tho' it be allowed, that, by Vertue of the perſonal Union between the divine and humane Nature, that the humane Nature is highly honoured and advanced, even to all the Glory and Dignity it may be made capable of, perhaps far above the Glory of Saints and Angels, and the higheſt Order of Cherubims, yet 'tis *ſtill but a Creature*, and finite; and conſequently not ſuſceptible of divine and infinite Perfections (which is the only Foundation of religious Worſhip;) ſo that the eſſential Glory of Chriſt's Godhead cannot be *communicated* to the humane Nature, any more than the divine Nature is *capable* of receiving any Imperfection, or Blemiſh, by its Union with the humane. Whence, as there is a Preſervation and Diſtinction of the two Natures, notwithſtanding their intimate and inſeparable Union in one Perſon, we ought to attribute to each Nature what is properly *due* unto it; that ſo reſerving the Properties *peculiar* to each, we may better underſtand how our bleſſed Lord is to be conſidered, and our Worſhip regulated accordingly; for no Pretences whatever can vindicate our paying Worſhip to Chriſt under *the preciſe Notion* of being only Mediator, whether we be *Arians*, *Socinians*, or *Trinitarians*. " It is a vain thing (ſays Mr. *Emlyn*) * to " think to excuſe themſelves by ſaying they do not wor- " ſhip the *Humanity* for itſelf, but as, and becauſe it is " united to the Divinity; ſince, as that Union does not " *change* the humane Nature into the divine Nature, ſo " neither does it hinder their Worſhip from being Crea- " ture-Worſhip: And if it be Idolatry to give divine " Worſhip to a Creature, then for any to offer a Rea- " ſon

* Two Tracts, pag. 109.

" ſon why they do ſo, is only to offer a Reaſon why " they commit Idolatry, inſtead of a Proof that 'tis not " ſuch: Thus they worſhip a Creature and a Man (that " is, according to them, they commit Idolatry) becauſe " it is united to the Divinity." Upon the whole, as nothing is clearer than that the humane Nature ſtill remains a Creature after its Exaltation to Glory, I conclude, that the infinite Excellency of the co-eſſential Son of God is the prime and only Cauſe of that divine Worſhip that is due and render'd to him, and not his being *conſtituted* Mediator by the Father, his Advancement to the Dignity and Dominion of Lord and King, or the Benefits that reſult from his Government, which at moſt are but *prevailing* Motives, &c. Which is what I intended to prove, and hope have done it to the Reader's Satisfaction, *viz.* that the Lord Jeſus Chriſt is not to be worſhiped as Mediator, or *as receiving Power and Authority from his Father by way of Gift*, but merely upon the Account of his own *intrinſick* Excellency as God, (which is the only *Baſis* of Honour) agreeable to the Command, *that all Men ſhould honour the Son as they honour the Father.*

But the Author tells us, with an Air of Conqueſt, *I have cited Paſſages which prove that Chriſt is to be worſhiped as Mediator, and as receiving Authority from the Father; and till ſome Texts are produced to prove that he has a Title to Worſhip on the Account barely of his eſſential Excellencies, I ſhall maintain, that Chriſt is to be worſhiped as Mediator.* †

Theſe Paſſages I have already ſhewn are miſapplied, and ſtrain'd; and yet not one of them, by the moſt *artful* Engine, can be fairly ſcrew'd to ſhew, that the Foundation of the Worſhip due to Chriſt is his *receiving Authority from the Father as a Gift.* I have alſo demonſtrated, that no Being is *worthy* of divine Honour, but upon

† Unity, p. 45.

on account of his *essential* Excellencies; and that for this Reason, chiefly, God *challenges* religious Worship as his incommunicable Due; that Christ is worshiped by Angels and Men in the same *Acts and Language* of Devotion: And 'tis remarkable, that the same Title God the Father has to our Worship, God the Son has also; for all those Texts, which teach us that Christ is God, and that he created, preserves, and upholds all things, shew, that he has the same Claim to divine Worship as the Father, *viz.* as *Creator* and *Governor* of the World (antecedent to his mediatorial Kingdom) which supposes his Dignity and essential Excellency. And this was all that Dr. *Waterland* aim'd to shew, *Defense*, pag. 275, which made me a little wonder at that Sentence in *Unity*, page 45; *And if the Scripture does not found his Title to Worship on these Powers, neither ought the Doctor to have done it.* The Doctor's Words are, as quoted by the Author himself, "I found the Son's Title to Wor-"ship upon the *Dignity of his Person*; his creative "Powers, declared in *John* i. 1. and elsewhere, his being "Θεὸς, God, from the Beginning, &c." In these Words, 'tis plain, the *Dignity* of Christ's Person is made the *primary* Foundation of Worship, and his creative Powers, &c. *expressive* of that Dignity, and so may be said, not very improperly, to be founded on Creation and Providence, as those Acts demonstrate the infinite Excellency of the Creator and Governor, who is the independent *Jehovah*, self-existent, self-sufficient, and God over all, who alone is to be worshiped with religious Adoration: And as an additional Proof of this, I produce this Text, *Isai.* xlv. 18. *For thus saith the Lord that created the Heavens, God himself that form'd the Earth, and made it* (which excludes all Instruments) *he hath established it, he created it not in vain, I am the Lord, there is none else.* In the following Verses he summons his People to worship him *alone*, and not to pray unto graven Images, or a God that cannot save; and in Verse 23, *I*

have

have ſworn by myſelf, the Word is gone out of my Mouth in Righteouſneſs, and ſhall not return, that unto me every Knee ſhall bow, every Tongue ſhall ſwear, &c. And 'tis worthy of ſpecial Notice, this very Text is applied to Chriſt, *Rom.* xiv. 11. And can we think, after ſo *ſolemn* an Oath, which is not to be *reverſed*, that the great God, who *cannot lie*, ſhould command us to honour and worſhip Chriſt, if he was not one with him? In ſhort, upon the *Trinitarian* Scheme, and no other, all thoſe Scriptures, which command Chriſt to be adored, are to be accounted for; ſince, as the learned Doctor well obſerves, "the ſame Scriptures, which declare him to be "adorable, deſcribe him alſo as God, and, together "with the Name, aſcribe to him likewiſe thoſe divine "Perfections, which make up, and form the Idea, ſig-"nified by ſo auguſt and venerable a Name." As Chriſt is God and Creator *one* with the Father, the Dignity of his Perſon, diſplayed by his creative Powers, is the *primary* Cauſe of all Worſhip; and all thoſe Texts, which prove the Creator is to be worſhiped, as ſtrongly argue that Chriſt's Dignity, *as Creator and God*, is the Ground thereof; ſo likewiſe, when God's Government of the World, which pre-ſuppoſes his infinite Eminency, is render'd as a Reaſon for our worſhiping him, the Dignity * of Chriſt, *by whom all things conſiſt*, who is the ſovereign Ruler of the World, is manifeſted; and conſequently *his Title* to Worſhip notify'd to us; for ſhould we abſtract his true and proper Godhead from his Government, the Worſhip due unto him, merely upon the Account of a *delegated* Authority, his Relation to us, and the Benefits he confers upon us, may be paid on the ſame footing to Prophets and holy Men, inveſted with any Office; to the Angels, who are *miniſtring* Spirits, &c. yea, to our Fathers, Princes, and Benefactors; to all that have Authority over us, are related to us, and beneficent

* Pſal. xxii. 27, 28.

neficent towards us. But though I am to honour my Father, and my Prince, both with inward Esteem, and outward Marks of Respect, proportionable to their Worth and Dignity, and to pay such Deference and Worship as is suitable to the *Authority* they have over me, &c. yet all this will amount to no more (as has been already shewn) than a civil and inferior Worship, according to the *limited* Excellency of the Object. Should I offer them religious Worship, which is due *only* to God, I doubt not but they would receive the Proposal with startling Horror and Indignation, as *Paul* and *Barnabas* did at *Lystra*, when the thoughtless and superstitious Inhabitants were for paying them religious Rites: *They rent their Clothes, and ran in among the People, crying out, and saying, Sirs, why do ye these things? we also are Men of like Passions with you, and preach unto you, that you should turn from these Vanities unto the living God, who made Heaven and Earth, the Sea, and all that is therein.* † For my part, I can see not the least Tracks of religious Worship that was ever to be given to any but God alone; there is no such thing allowed of, or countenanc'd in the Scriptures; and sincerely profess, did I believe the blessed Saviour of Souls to be only *a God by Office*, advanced to so high a Dignity by a supreme God, I should heartily close in with *Francken*, and other *Socinians*, who keep tight to their Principles, in denying him all religious Worship, because a Creature, for fear of falling into gross Idolatry, and coming under the heavy Charge of *doing Service* to them which are by Nature no Gods.

The Author indeed imagines he has a *Solution* for all the Difficulties that can be urged against his Hypothesis; and that is his third Particular.

Thirdly, *I observe, that all the Worship, which is to be given to Christ, must and does redound to the Glory of his God and Father.* ‡

But

† Acts xiv. 14, 15. ‡ Unity, pag. 45.

But is this a Salvo for the *unrival'd*, and undivided Glory of the ſupreme Being? that his incommunicable Due, his Worſhip, muſt be *firſt ſolemnly offer'd* to another Being, who is not God, contrary to the expreſs and *irrepealable* Oath of his ſovereign Majeſty, *That unto him every Knee ſhould bow.* * Will this Fetch, ſtrange and prepoſterous! ſkreen us from the Edge of that eternal and inviolable Law, *Thou ſhalt have no other Gods before me, nor bow before them, nor ſerve them?* When *Jehovah* expreſly declares, *Before me was there no God formed, neither ſhall there be after me?* ¶ How eaſily might the Pagans worſhip all the Gods of their Invention, and yet fully evade the keeneſt Charge of Idolatry, only by ſaying, that all the Worſhip they paid to others was to the Glory of the ſupreme God, and ultimately *terminated* in him? And this really deſerves a ſerious Thought, ſeeing they actually made uſe of this very Diſtinction to vindicate their fulſome Idolatries. For 'tis notorious that theſe were the Sentiments of the Generality, at leaſt, of the *wiſeſt*, and moſt thinking Part of the Heathens, that all Worſhip paid to their Dæmons, or inferior Gods, tended to the Honour of the ſupreme God, or God of Gods: And the Reaſons they urged for paying religious Rites to them, was upon Account of the Authority they were inveſted with, their conveying Bleſſings to Mankind, their introducing them to the divine Preſence, *&c.* nay, and that the ſupreme God *appointed* it to be ſo. The Reverend Dr. *Whitby*, for whom the Author, not unjuſtly, has ſo great a Veneration, having given a conciſe, accurate, and exact Account of this in his Annotation upon *Col.* ii. 18. *I* ſhall take leave to tranſcribe it, leaving out the Citations.

1. They pretended that the divine Nature could not immediately be converſed with, but that all the Inter-

* Iſai. xlv. 23. ¶ Iſai. xliii. 10.

courſe betwixt God and Men was by the *Intermediation* of theſe Dæmons; it being a debaſing of the divine Nature, to think we could converſe with him without their Intervention.

2. That they were to be worſhip'd for their laudable Interceſſion, and for the *Benefits* of common Life we receive from them.

3. As having from the ſupreme Deity their Power and Authority, and preſiding over us according to the Order appointed to them; and being therefore worſhip'd by the divine Law and Counſel, and only, ſaith *Celſus*, as he will have them to be honour'd.

4. By worſhiping theſe Miniſters of his, we do a thing *grateful* to him.

This is all Fact, and ſupported by too many Teſtimonies to be deny'd, as may be ſeen at leiſure. And as to what he labours from Dr. *Cudworth* to ſhew, that *the Bulk of the Heathens worſhiped many co-ordinate and independent Gods*, * tho' we ſhou'd grant this of ſome of the vulgar People, yet if their Philoſophers, who were the Defenders of their Faith, believ'd in one ſupreme God, and notwithſtanding worſhip'd, *as Mediators*, other Gods of an inferior Dignity; were they chargeable or not with Polytheiſm and Idolatry? Upon the Author's Principles, all that they could be culpable in was their falſe Pretences to a Command from the ſupreme Being, which they had not: But we know the Apoſtle, without conſidering whether their Orders from the ſupreme God were genuine or not, charges them home with an *inexcuſable* Breach of the Law of Nature, in worſhiping the Creature more than, or beſides, the Creator †; and certainly, if Idolatry only lay in worſhiping any Being without the Command of the Supreme, the Scriptures would have taken Notice of ſo important a thing. But, alas,

Worſhip

---

* Reply, *p.* 14. † Rom. i. 20.

Worſhip is fixed upon another Footing, the intrinſick Excellency of the Object; from which Principle the Heathens deviated, in worſhiping, not co-ordinate Gods, but more Gods beſides the ſupreme; for, " an Infinity " of Teſtimonies might be cited from *Plutarch*, *Seneca*; " *Maximus* of *Tyre*, *Plato*; *Virgil*, *Hecataeus Abderita*, *Xeno-* " *phanes Colophonienſis*, *Orpheus*, *Cicero*; and a Multitude " of others; who have all aſſerted, that the Pagans re- " ceived but one ſupreme, infinite, and ſelf-exiſtent " God, unto whom the Title of *Optimus Maximus*, the " Greateſt and the Beſt, was alone aſcribed. And that " for thoſe other innumerable Divinities, call'd *Gods*, " they were only ſo term'd in an inferior and ſeconda- " ry Senſe, as they had ſome Reſemblance in their Na- " tures and Virtues to the ſupreme God, from whom " they were deriv'd and generated, and whoſe Children " and Off-ſpring they were, and as they were Interceſ- " ſors, and Mediators between him and the Sons of " Men. § And this both Heathen and Chriſtian Writers do acknowledge to be Fact, as that excellent Author has there ſhewn by a Cloud of Witneſſes; and the Lord *Herbert*, who *purpoſely* wrote of the Religion of the Pagans, * delivers it as his ſettled Opinion, " That nei- " ther the Learned nor Ignorant did ever queſtion that " there always was, and now is, one ſupreme God. " And afterwards, ¶ ſpeaking of the Cauſes of Religion among the Heathens, he introduces their crafty Prieſts, in order to extend their Gain, pleading to this purpoſe with the Populace, for their worſhiping a Plurality of Gods, *viz.* " That tho' there was one ſupreme Being, " there might be other inferior Deities, and that they " ought therefore to pay Adoration to thoſe, as next to " the ſupreme God; that 'twas improbable he would " be diſpleas'd with this Adoration paid to *inferior Dei-*

§ Sir *Peter King*'s critical Hiſtory of the Creed, *p.* 58. * Religion of the Gentiles, *p.* 255. ¶ *p.* 270.

" *ties*, in regard *it ultimately terminated in the ſupreme God* " *himſelf*, the Author and Maker of all things, *&c.*" How near this comes to the Author's Scheme is eaſily ſeen; and if the Heathens were Idolaters for worſhiping more Gods beſides the ſupreme, let him think *how hard* it is for us ever to be perſuaded, that God ſhou'd, by his Command, warrant what he hates, what he has condemn'd, what he has enter'd an expreſs Caveat againſt, and can't, conſiſtent with his Honour and Oath, finally permit with Impunity. But perhaps the Author's Notion may appear in his Eye a little more *refin'd* than the dreggy Idolatries of the Heathen World, and even prun'd of ſome of thoſe *Incumbrances* that clog the common Hypotheſis of his Brethren; for he ſeems to diſown the Diſtinction of a *ſupreme* and *ſubordinate* Worſhip, *as having no Occaſion to defend it* *; tho' in his ſtating of Worſhip, *p.* 38. he *directly* aſſerts it; which ſhews how eaſy it is to this Author to ſay and unſay. But what then can he aim at? Why, the Sum of his Deſign is to prove, † that our Worſhip *paſſes through Chriſt to the Father*. But I don't think this mends the broken Hypotheſis at all; for either the ſame ſupreme Worſhip is hereby paid to Chriſt, as to the Father, or none at all. (*1ſt.*) That Worſhip which paſſes through Chriſt to the Father is *ſupreme* by the Author's Confeſſion. This ſame Worſhip, according to him, is *firſt* paid to Chriſt, and conſequently is ſupreme; unleſs we can ſuppoſe the *Intention* of the Worſhiper to make ſome Difference, or the Worſhip itſelf to be *chang'd* by Conveyance. Or rather,

(*2dly*) If he ſays this Worſhip don't fix and reſt in Chriſt, as its proper Object, and ſo upon this account is not ſupreme, *becauſe it ultimately centers in the Father:*

Then

* Unity, *p.* 49.

† *Pag.* 50.

Then our bleſſed Lord can be only the *Medium* of conveying ſupreme Worſhip to the ſupreme Being; and ſo at laſt the Worſhip that is render'd to Chriſt is none at all; but he is only the Meſſenger or *Internuntius* to deliver our Prayers, &c. to God, as *Moſes* was between the moſt High and the Children of *Iſrael*. When the People had vow'd Obedience to all God's Commandments, *Moſes return'd the Words of the People unto the Lord*: And if our Saviour be no more than the *Conveyer* of our Worſhip to his Father, 'tis needleſs to contend what Worſhip the Author allows his Redeemer, when he ſtrikes off all at once, and *makes him only a bare Internuntius*. But ſeeing he lays great Streſs upon this, even as to think he has ſafely retreated out of the way of all Objections, by regulating divine Worſhip in ſuch a manner that it ſhall *only paſs thro' Chriſt* without touching, and ultimately arrive to the Father, and *center* in him, and ſo what we offer up to his Son muſt *ultimately* redound to his Glory; I ſhall conſider what he has to ſupport this fair and plain Method of worſhiping Chriſt with no Worſhip. And all that he has produc'd, or can, is but one *miſapply'd* Text, which no reaſonable Man can conceive ſhould *ſtem* the whole *Torrent* of the inſpired Writings, that *run* another way.

The Paſſage is *Phil.* ii. 11. *That every Tongue ſhould confeſs, that Jeſus Chriſt is Lord, to the Glory of God the Father.*

'Tis plain from the Context, that the Deſign of theſe Words was to ſhew, that the bleſſed Redeemer of the World ſhould be acknowledg'd by all Tongues and Nations as their Sovereign Lord. And leſt any ſhould think this univerſal Homage, which was to be paid to the Son, and which was not known ſo diſtinctly under the Old Teſtament, ſhould detract from the Honour of the Father; the Apoſtle, to prevent all Miſtakes, adds, *To the Glory of God the Father*; which is exactly true, not only as the Honour of either redounds to the Father and Son,

who are *essentially* of equal Dignity and Majesty; but also as the Father is consider'd, in the stupendious and amazing Work of Redemption, first in Order, Counsel, and Operation, the Subjection and Obedience which we give to Christ in the Character of Redeemer, and the only Lord of Christians, redounds to the Glory of the Father, whose good Pleasure it was thus to constitute him Redeemer; who having to this End assum'd humane Nature into a close Union with his own Person, and died for Sin, which was a Demonstration that he was Man; having rais'd himself from the Dead, which was also a bright Display of his Godhead; he is now to be honour'd, admir'd, and ador'd, upon account of his divine Nature, under the Relation of a Redeemer; the Benefits of his Death and Resurrection at the same time affording *inviolable Motives* and pressing Obligations to render it unto him, and all to the Glory of God the Father as well as his own; *for the Father is glorify'd in the Son*, the Brightness of his Glory.

That this is the genuine Meaning of this Passage I appeal to the Scope of the Apostle in this Chapter; who, that he might effectually urge his beloved *Philippians* to Unanimity and Concord, exhorts them *mutually* to stoop and condescend to one another, *v.* 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. And in order to excite them to this happy and lovely Temper, he proposes the Humiliation of our blessed Lord, as the brightest and *most moving* Example, *v.* 5. *Who being in the Form of God, thought it not Robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no Reputation, and took upon him the Form of a Servant. And being found in Fashion as a Man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Cross.*

Against this Translation I know 'tis generally objected, that the original Words, οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ, should be render'd, *He did not arrogate or assume an Equality with God.*—But is it such a pregnant Instance of *Humility* for a mere Creature not to affect Equality to his

eternal

eternal Creator, between whom and him there is an awful, infinite Diſtance? Where, at this rate, can be the *Force* of the Apoſtle's Reaſoning? Its Beauty declines and withers away, and all the Strength of the Argument is loſt at once. But if we keep to the obvious and *literal* Meaning of the Phraſe, how cogent and how preſſing is it! The Lord of Glory, who was equal to God the Father, diſrobed himſelf of his Majeſty and Brightneſs, *the Form of God*, and put on *the Form of a Servant*, becoming Man, and appearing, acting, and converſing as ſuch, like unto us, *Sin only excepted*, and at laſt ſuffer'd the torturing Rack of the Croſs for our ſakes; which is ſuch an unparallel'd Inſtance of divine Charity and Condeſcenſion, as may at once *command* our higheſt Wonder, and challenge our moſt faithful and zealous Imitation.

'Tis without Controverſy, that Chriſt's Humiliation is the Pattern here *recommended* to be follow'd; and if ſo, admitting for once, that οὐχ ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο, &c. muſt be tranſlated, *he did not aſſume, ſnatch at, or covet an Equality with God*; this Gloſs is entirely reconcileable to the Trinitarian Scheme; and thus, very conſiſtent with it, Dr. *Waterland* has paraphras'd it. * "Who being eſſentially God, and conſequently having a rightful Claim "to be honour'd equally with God, yet did not covet "or deſire to be ſo honour'd; did not inſiſt upon his "Right; but for the greater Glory of God, and for the "Good of others, choſe rather, in this particular Inſtance "of his Incarnation, to wave his Pretenſions, and in Appearance to recede from them."

So that as our Lord's Humility, in becoming Man, and dying for us, is recommended as the fulleſt Pattern of Condeſcenſion and Goodneſs in the foregoing Verſes; if theſe Words be render'd, *He counted it no Robbery to be equal with God*, or that he did not *covet* an Equality with

* Sermon, *p.* 167.

God, as he *justly* might have done; but in this Instance of his *Incarnation* wav'd it; either Sense of the Phrase will suit with Trinitarian Principles (tho' the first is most natural, and what was never sufficiently confuted †) and be agreeable to the Context, which was to press us to Condescension, &c. by directing the Believer's Eye to the *amazing Stoop* of the Son of God, as an uncommon Example of it. So that this Text, however strain'd and tortur'd from its native and pure Meaning, stands still as a firm and unshaken Proof of the essential Equality of the Son to the Father: For tho' our blessed Lord by his Incarnation conceal'd his Glory under the Vail of his Flesh; and, as he assum'd human Nature, was liable to all the Miseries of it, and to Death it self; yet his Glory was not long shadow'd, but again *broke forth*, as the Sun out of an Eclipse: And as the Sun is the same in itself, whether darken'd by an intervening Shadow, or shining in its full Splendor; so the Son of God was absolutely, immutably glorious in himself, tho', with *respect to us*, he was pleas'd to lay aside his Pomp and Majesty, *and appear'd in the Likeness of Men*. Hence *his Flesh* or human Nature is expressly call'd *the Vail*, *Heb.* x. 20. —But this lowly State could last no longer than till the Ends of it were all accomplish'd; for, *v.* 9. 'tis said, *Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a Name which is above every Name*, *i. e.* as by his becoming Man, and undergoing an ignominious Death, he was greatly humbled; so by God's raising him from the Dead, he hath also highly exalted him, and thereby *declared*, that he hath given him, or *solemnly install'd him* in the Possession and Exercise of a Power and Authority superior to all, in the Character of God-man and Redeemer, which he always had as God, &c.

That

† See *Hammond* upon the Place.

That the Particle Διὸ, *wherefore*, does not denote the Cauſe, but the *Order* of Chriſt's Exaltation, as a *Conſequence* of his Sufferings, I make no doubt (tho' ſuppoſing the former, it gives little or *no Occaſion* for Cavil) becauſe 'tis what is agreeable to the Words of our Lord to his Diſciples: *Ought not Chriſt to have ſuffer'd theſe things, and to enter into his Glory*? Luke xxiv. 26. and to 1 *Pet.* i. 11. where the Spirit of Chriſt is ſaid to teſtify of his Sufferings, and *the Glory that ſhould follow*, which the Term *alſo* in the Text confirms. And I concur with the Author in his Reply, * that this Paſſage treats of *a proper* Exaltation, as far as 'tis *oppos'd* to a State of Humiliation in the Context; the chief Reaſon that Dr. *Waterland* has offer'd againſt it, being, "one that is truly Son of God, "and in a proper Senſe God, cannot be properly exalted, "*i. e.* cannot be prefer'd to any higher or better State "than he ever enjoy'd, &c." † which is very true, but not pat; becauſe the ſame Reaſon would ſerve to prove he was *never* humbled, it being impoſſible that God ſhou'd be *capable* of a real Depreſſion. But tho' I fall in with the Author, that theſe Words ſpeak of a proper Exaltation, as far as 'tis oppos'd to Chriſt's Humiliation, it will not *differve* what I am aiming to prove; for the Humiliation of our bleſſed Lord was nothing elſe but a *vailing of his Glories in the Garb of Humanity*, as has been already ſhewn; and conſequently his Exaltation was nothing but an *opening* or diſplaying theſe Glories, whereby his *Dignity* was proclaim'd, and ſo in effect it ſtill comes to what Dr. *Waterland* intended. For 'tis certain, by means of our Lord's Reſurrection or Exaltation, the Glory of his divine Nature was declared, which he had with his Father before the World was, as well as *a new Acceſſion* of Glory and Excellency given to his human Nature; for by this he was inaugurated or more ſolemnly inveſted

* *Iag.* 33. † Serm. *p.* 170.

ted in the Administration of his mediatorial Kingdom, whereby his divine Majesty, which had been vailed during his Incarnation, shone out again in its Brightness; and he, who *was despis'd of Men* whilst on Earth, appears now to have a Dignity, Power, and Glory above all; and this Power of governing the World, which he had always as God, the Father gives him since he became Man also, and *sustains a new Character*, in order to complete the Designs of Redemption, according to the Oeconomy of Salvation; so that he who is our Mediator, is the Object of Worship, not as Mediator, or *as receiving a delegated Authority*, but because this very Person is *one* in Essence with the Father; and tho' the Father gave him this Power, 'tis by no means *derogatory* from the Deity of the Son; for Inequality, *in respect of Office*, can never be prov'd inconsistent with exact Equality in respect of Nature; and therefore in the next Words 'tis said, *That at the Name of Jesus every Knee shou'd bow*; a Token and Expression of Homage, Obedience and Subjection due only to the great *Jehovah*, Is. xlv. 23.

Now when the Apostle had thus magnify'd the very glorious Dignity of God the Son, how natural was it for him, as he had by this Description set forth Christ as universal Governor and Saviour, and the sovereign Object of every Creature's Worship, to suggest this, even *to the Glory of God the Father*? that we might not be so *wholly wrapt* up in viewing and adoring the Excellency of the Son of God, who had given himself for us (which was enough to touch all the Springs of Gratitude) so as to *forget* the Father of Mercies, the God of Love, who sent his Son into the World, appointed, authoriz'd, and design'd him to this magnificent Office. Upon this Account we are to confess Christ Lord to the Glory of the Father as well as the Son, *and no otherwise* is the Father glorified. In all our Worship then of him we should have *an Eye* to the Glory of the Father, with whom he is one God and Lord, and *as such only* adorable;

adorable; whence it is that we are commanded *to honour the Son as we do the Father*, &c. This positive, severe, and strict Command was given at first, and still seems necessary to be inculcated, lest any shou'd conceive, that as the Son of God was now sent of the Father, and that in the Form of a Servant, this Honour should not be due unto him; and as Dr. *Owen* observes, "The World "was then far from thinking it was so, and many, I fear, "are yet of the same Mind." †

The Author attempts in the next place to guess *how we may confess Christ to the Glory of the Father*, viz. *When we confess that Christ is made Lord by the Father, we speak to the Glory of the Father who made him Lord and Christ; and so in worshiping of him we worship the Father.* As a Proof of this, he refers us to *Acts* ii. 36. But as it happens, there is not the least Mention of his being worship'd in the Text or Context; the *Design* of the Apostle *Peter* being only to prove that Jesus of *Nazareth* was the true *Messiah*, § and particularly *declar'd* to be so by his Resurrection from the Dead; and that they might not mistake him whom he meant, he points out the very Person they knew by the Name of Jesus, and had not *long since* crucify'd and rejected, *v.* 36. *Therefore let all the House of* Israel *know assuredly, that God has made the same Jesus, whom ye have crucify'd, both Lord and Christ.*——Now had it been here said, that Jesus Christ, whom they had crucify'd, was made Lord by this Exaltation, and, *by virtue of a Power receiv'd from God at this time*, was to be worship'd and ador'd by all Tongues and Nations, tho' he never had *before* any Claim to it, &c. this would have been to our Author's Purpose; but there is not *one Place* in the whole sacred Records that can bear any such Sense: And 'tis fully evident, that neither this Passage, wherein Christ is said *to be made Lord*, nor that in *Philippians*, can denote his *first* Investiture,

† Of the Person of Christ, *p.* 115. § *v.* 22, 23.

Inveſtiture, but only a publick Inſtallment, or more ſolemn Exerciſe of the glorious Office: For 'tis expreſly ſaid, *Luke* ii. 11. *Unto you is born this Day a Saviour, which is Chriſt the Lord.* And in many other Places Jeſus is ſtyl'd *emphatically* Chriſt and Lord, *before* his Exaltation; nay, he was called and ſanctify'd, and commiſſioned to diſcharge this important Office, before ever he was ſent into the World; which is a Demonſtration that theſe Words cannot refer immediately to his Exaltation, as the *Time* or *Reaſon* of his being made Lord, and becoming thereby an Object of Worſhip, ſince he was ſo long before, even from Everlaſting, God and Lord.

As to what he offers to obviate what Dr. *Waterland* had ſaid, *That the Honour of* either *did redound* to both, is very feeble; *viz. A King may glorify an Ambaſſador; but Honour given to the King will not redound to the Glory of the Ambaſſador, though all Honour done to the Ambaſſador, as ſuch, redounds to the Glory of his Sovereign.* * As *ſuch* I grant it does; but what Agreement is there in this Inſtance to the Honour paid to Chriſt? Which redounds to the Father, not merely by *Vertue* of his *Office*, but as he is in Reality the eternal Brightneſs of his Father's Glory, and by Nature *very God*, of the ſame Eſſence with the Father; and conſequently, what redounds to one as God, *equally centers in both*, who are of inſeparable Glory and Majeſty: So that it can be no Derogation from the Honour of the Father, becauſe the divine Nature being *abſolutely the ſame* in the Son as the Father, by honouring the Son we honour the Father, and by deſpiſing the Son we deſpiſe the Father, for he and the Father are one. But the Author proceeds.

Beſides this general Account, I ſhall ſhew how each particular Inſtance, of what is called *Worſhiping of Chriſt, redounds to the Glory of God the Father.*

How

---

* Unity, pag. 46.

How deeply engaged for the Honour of the new Scheme, how fond of its Succeſs *at any Rate*, muſt the Author, be to run Matters ſo far, as to intimate that our bleſſed Redeemer is not to be worſhiped! For 'tis plain in this Paragraph that he boggles at it; for otherwiſe he would not ſay, *what is called worſhiping of Chriſt.* But if he is not truly worſhiped, and the Honour paid to him is *falſly* term'd, what need had the Author to ſhew, *That the Worſhip which is given to Chriſt*, (and to inſtance particularly, *in religious Faith, Love, Swearing, Prayer and Obedience) muſt and does redound to the Glory of the Father*? Is not this all Amuſement? But I'll put a more candid Conſtruction upon the Paragraph, and ſuppoſe him only to trip in the Expreſſion, and that, after all, he really means that our Lord ſhould, in a *proper Senſe*, be worſhiped; and yet ſtill all theſe particular Inſtances of Worſhip paid to him, which he has collected as *redounding* to the Glory of the Father, may be eaſily reconciled, only by ſaying what has been already proved, that Chriſt, who is Mediator, being God alſo, is to be worſhiped, though not as Mediator; and therefore 'twill be enough to give a *Specimen* of this, by examining the firſt Inſtance the Author has produced, the reſt being of the ſame Import, but, if it can *be*, far more trifling.

The firſt Inſtance is, *believing on Chriſt*, † grounded on *Joh.* xii. 44. *He that believeth on me, believeth not on me, but on him that ſent me; i. e.* according to the Turn of the Author, *He does not ſo much believe on me as on the Father, or his Faith does not terminate on me, but on the Father*: Whereas all that our Lord intended by this Expreſſion was to ſhew, that their believing on him was a giving Credit to the divine Teſtimony concerning him, and hereby they *not only* believed in him, but God *alſo*. So, *Mark* ix. 37. *Whoſoever ſhall receive me, receiveth not me,* (only)

† Unity, p. 46.

(only) *but him that sent me.* Thus God tells *Samuel*, when the People had actually rejected him, *They have not rejected thee*, (only) *but they have rejected me also.* § That this sets the Text in a true Light is evident from *John* xiv. 1. where our Lord tells his Disciples, *Let not your Hearts be troubled; ye believe in God, believe* (also) *in me:* Which clearly shews, that he who is our Mediator was the Object of their Faith and Trust as well as the Father, though not as Mediator: *q. d.* You believe in God, who is the Almighty Preserver and Governor of all things, *believe also in me*, being one in Nature, Power, and Majesty with him; especially, since I am *now* become your Messiah and Redeemer, and so your Lord and Governor by a new and *special* Title, and will certainly take care of all your Concerns, so that you need not be immoderately troubled, distrustful, or disconsolate, at your losing Sight of me for a time, *for I go to prepare a Place for you*, &c. As for the other Text, 1 *Pet.* i. 21. *By him you do believe in God that rais'd him up from the Dead*, and *gave him Glory, that your Faith and Hope might be in God.* 'Tis not here said, *by believing in him you do believe in God*; but *by him barely*; which may denote his Power, *enabling* us to do it; or his Doctrine, by which we are *taught to do it*; or by his Mediation, as one that has made Satisfaction for Sin, we are brought to believe in him, as a *reconciled* God, and so to fix our Faith and Hope in him. Or even supposing it had been said, *By believing in Christ you do believe in God*, it would only have shewn us, that Christ in his lowest Character, who was rais'd from the Dead, is not the Object of our Worship, but *only* as he was God; *q. d.* by believing on Christ you really believe in the Son of God, and very God, *who, being one with his Father*, rais'd the Man Christ Jesus from the Dead, and gave him Glory, that your Faith and Hope might not be in a *mere*

§ 1 Sam. viii. 7.

a *mere* Man; but in God; otherwiſe, thoſe who believe in Chriſt would be accurſed, according to *Jer.* xvii. 51. *Curſed be the Man that truſteth in Man.* Upon the whole, is the Father to be honoured? ſo is the Son: Is the Father to be believed on? ſo is the Son: Is he to be lov'd? are we to ſwear by him, pray unto him, obey him? ſo is the Son alſo. And theſe, and all other Inſtances of Worſhip, we render to the Son, redound to the Glory of the Father, *as well as the Son*, the Father and he being one; ſo that it will be found at laſt, *that he that deſpiſeth Chriſt, deſpiſeth him that ſent him*; ¶ not only as he was *his Father's Servant*, as the Author hints, but more eſpecially, *as his Son*, Mark xi. 6. *Having yet therefore one Son, his well-beloved Son, he ſent him alſo laſt unto them, ſaying, they will reverence my Son.* Every one knows to whom the Parable, in which theſe Words are, is apply'd, and in whom *it is fulfilled.* The *Jews* had deſpiſed and rejected God's Servants and Ambaſſadors, the Prophets; and at laſt they crucify'd the *Heir of all*, the Lord of Life and Glory, which was the great Enhancement of their Sin: And may not the ſame Guilt be faſtened on thoſe who now deſpiſe the Sonſhip and Deity of Chriſt, I pray God of his infinite Mercy, for the ſake of Chriſt, grant; tho' they *deny the Lord God that bought them, Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.*

What I have offered in Plea againſt this firſt Inſtance may ſuffice, and therefore I ſhall wave the reſt; the rather, becauſe how plain and eaſy ſoever he imagines his *entangled* Scheme to be, he is himſelf *aware* of an Objection made uſe of by the Doctor, that he, nor all the *Goliahs* of his Party, will *ever, ever* be able to anſwer, *viz. that all religious Worſhip is, in Scripture, appropriated to God only.* ‡

To

¶ Luke x. 16. ‡ Unity, p. 49.

To get clear of this *insupportable* Rock of Offence, he asks, *Whether the Doctor means, that all religious Worship must terminate in God only, or ultimately redound alone to his Glory? This*, says he, *is undoubtedly true, but nothing against us.* Whether against you or not, it shews, that Christ is not to be worshiped as Mediator at all, or that he has no Glory *by what is called Worship* by you; for if it redounds *alone* to the Glory of the Father, the Son is thereby *excluded* from *any* Glory. But to come closer, he would further know, *Whether the Doctor means by this, that we must not offer to any other Being, besides the supreme God, even such religious Worship as redounds to the Glory of God?* * To which I answer, we must not offer to any Being, *besides* the Supreme, any religious Worship at all; God himself has absolutely forbidden it upon the *severest* Penalties; and what should lead Men to think the contrary? Can the worshiping of a Creature advance the divine Honour, contrary to his Word, his Oath, his Law, his Gospel? For though we acknowledge Christ is to be worshiped, 'tis only upon the Account of his *being God*, equal to the Father, and not *as Mediator*; and therefore what the Author insinuates, that the Trinitarians *terminate their Worship on the Father*, if he means only on him, exclusive of the Son, and Holy Ghost, 'tis a palpable Mistake; for Father, Son, and Holy Ghost being truly one God, and possess'd of all divine Perfections, which is the formal Reason of divine Worship, they are, and ever will be, the eternal Object of our Adoration, and highest Love and Praise: And no Being, besides God, how highly *exalted* soever, will as much as have *any Share* in divine Worship, whilst that stands recorded in the sacred Volume, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve*, Matt. iv. 10. But this very Passage the Author attempts to explain away

* Page 50.

away very prettily, from a manner of *solving* Difficulties of this Nature, I dare say, *unknown* to any, but Men of the quickest Turn of Thought at a Lift; and that is, by considering some Expressions met with in Scripture, that seem to rhime, and which therefore he would have to be *exactly* parallel Cases. As,

1st. *It is said in the Text before us, Him only shalt thou serve; yet we read,* Heb. xiii. 10. *that the Priests serve the Tabernacle.* Whence he would have us to infer, *that the Tabernacle was not the supreme God; but that the Priests in serving the Tabernacle did serve God, who required them to serve it.* †

A smooth and easy Solution! exactly level to the Understanding of him *that can read only his Mother-Tongue.* ‡ But, I hope, none of those, for whose sake the Author writes, will be found so little learned, so ignorant and careless, as to suffer so unwarrantable an Imposition to be *slipp'd* upon them; for who does not, or may not easily see, if his Eyes are not *sealed* with Prejudice, that *serving God*, and *serving the Tabernacle*, are Terms that carry in themselves, as apply'd to such different Subjects, vastly different Ideas? And though he contends in his *Reply*, ¶ that *the Word λατρεύω is made use of in both Cases to express it*, it can be of no Weight, seeing this Word is *promiscuously* apply'd to signify either *civil* or *religious* Service. Thus, in *Levit.* xxiii. 7. *Ye shall do no servile Work therein*, where the *Septuagint* has it, πᾶν ἔργον λατρευτὸν ὐ ποιήσητε. And *Ludovicus Vives*, in his Commentary upon *Augustine de Civitate Dei*, hath proved out of *Suidas*, *Xenophon* and *Valla*, that δουλεύειν and λατρεύειν, are *usually* taken one for another.* And that there can be no Force in this Argument is plain; for when we are commanded to serve God, *divine Worship* is intended in the *highest* Sense of it, as in the Passage before us; *Thou*

 shalt

† Unity, p. 51. ‡ See Unity, p. 1. &c. ¶ Pag. 28.
* See *Taylor*'s Christ's Combat, and Conquest, pag 348.

ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve: But when the Prieſts are ſaid to *ſerve the Altar*, 'tis explained in Scripture, *by taking the Overſight thereof, or miniſtring before it*, &c. † So that though it be allowed that the Prieſts ſerv'd God in this, as they did it *in Obedience* to his Commands; yet when 'tis ſaid they *ſerved* the Tabernacle, the Word muſt be taken in a quite different Senſe; becauſe, *as they miniſtred before the Tabernacle* under the *preciſe* Notion of doing it in Obedience to the divine Command, they *only ſerved God*, and not the Tabernacle, unleſs we make the Tabernacle *alſo* an Object of Worſhip. This well calculated Rule of Explication then can ſerve no End, unleſs it be to puzzle an honeſt undiſcerning Reader, or to ſhew the Author's *happy way* of drawing Parallels; but by Virtue of this, we have another Caſe produc'd of the ſame kind, the Examination of which, I hope, will ſet the Whole in a proper Light.

2dly, *It is commanded*, 1 Sam. vii. 3. *Prepare your Hearts unto the Lord, and ſerve him only; and yet God expreſly commands, ſaying*, Exod. xxi. 6. *His Maſter ſhall bore his Ear through with an Awl, and he ſhall ſerve him (his Maſter) for ever: But if a Man were to ſerve God alone, it may be aſk'd, how could he then be allow'd to ſerve his Maſter?**

What! an Anſwer expected to ſo lean a Query? can the Author think a Servant may not do his Maſter's Work, and perform all civil Service and Obedience to him, which is his *reſpective* Due, and yet it ſtill remain indiſputable, that God is to be ſerv'd alone, *i. e. worſhip'd only*, and not *his Maſter* at all, with divine Honours? And if this Inſtance is produc'd to any other Purpoſe, it can be of no Service to him; for 'tis evident, when the Scripture ſays, *Servants, obey in all things your Maſters according to the Fleſh; not with Eye-ſervice, as Men-pleaſers, but in Singleneſs of Heart,*

† Numb. iv. 16. xviii. 2, 3. * Unity. p. 51.

Heart, fearing God; * the Design of the Apoſtle in theſe Words is *only* to ſhew, that the Chriſtian Religion did not ſet Servants at ſuch a Liberty as to *vacate* their Obligations to Civil Service, and diſengage them from *Subjection* to their unbelieving Maſters; and therefore, to prevent Idleneſs or Diſcontent, he exhorts them to diligent Obedience, for the ſake of Chriſt, who ſaw their Hearts and Ways, and had made it their *incumbent* Duty; and for their greater Encouragement he tells them, that when they ſerved their Maſters out of a *Compliance* to the divine Precept, their *Motive* to Obedience was generous, diſintereſted, and chriſtian; *ye ſerve* (ſays he) *the Lord Chriſt* (which by the way is call'd *fearing God*, ver. 22. implying that Chriſt is God, their *ſupreme* Lord and Maſter, whom they ſhould obey in this Inſtance) he having made it their Duty by his Command, in keeping of which they only *obey'd* him, and not in bare ſerving their Maſters; for 'tis poſſible to ſerve them, and *at the ſame time* to diſobey Chriſt: So that abſtracting the divine Precept, a Servant's Obedience to the Commands of a Maſter is not ſerving God; but when, by virtue of *his Command*, I ſerve my Prince, my Country, or my Friend, I do a Duty; and conſequently, ſerve God, which may be *extended* to every thing that comes within the Compaſs of Duty. This is obvious, *chap.* iv. *ver.* 1. *Maſters, give unto your Servants that which is juſt and equal, knowing that ye alſo have a Maſter in Heaven.* So that paying my Servants their Wages is as much ſerving God, as *their ſerving me* is ſerving him; becauſe the Motive and *Principle* of Action is the very ſame, *viz.* the *Command* of God, and his *Glory*, which ſhould be the Centre of all we do. So that the Author might as well have argued, God is not to be ſerv'd excluſive of others, *becauſe I muſt pay what I owe*; or becauſe in *eating and drinking*,

* Col. iii. 22.

king, and in every other Step of Life, *I muſt do all to the Glory of God.* And is this ſo eaſy a Method to unravel Difficulties? will it avail any thing to prove others are ſerv'd, *i. e. not worſhip'd*, therefore God only is not worſhip'd with religious Worſhip? Thoſe who can ſpy any Depth of Reaſoning in this, I preſume, will be thought Perſons of no great Acumen, or elſe Men reſolv'd to make *Inroads* upon common Senſe; for tho' I ſerve my Maſter, in Obedience to God's Command, this Service *ultimately centers in himſelf only*, and is all employ'd for his Uſe, and has no Manner of *Relation* to God, any further than *as I do it for Conſcience ſake*; and conſequently, is quite of a different Nature than that which is due to God only, which is divine Homage, Adoration, and Allegiance, anſwerable to the Object; whereas the Service due to earthly Maſters is *barely civil*, having regard to their Relation, Superiority, *&c.* and ſo is *confin'd and limited* to them alone, and can never be *offer'd* to God without the greateſt *Affront* to the Honour of his Majeſty. So that it ſtill remains as a Demonſtration, *that God only is to be worſhip'd* with all divine religious Honours; nay, this very Caſe ſuppoſes it. So that whoever durſt venture to lay any Weight upon the Author's *airy* Fabrick, will find it ſoon ſinking under him, as having no Foundation in the Reaſon of things, or the Word of God.

His laſt Inſtance is in *David*, *Pſal.* li. 4. *Againſt thee* (O God) *thee only have I ſinned. And yet* (ſays he) *no one queſtions but that he ſinned againſt* Uriah *alſo.**

In Anſwer to this I would obſerve, that according to the Apoſtle's Definition, *Sin is the Tranſgreſſion of the Law*; and where there is no Law, there can be no Tranſgreſſion, and conſequently no Sin: And this every one that has ſtudied the Nature of Laws knows, that I can ſin againſt

* Unity, p. 52.

againſt none but the Lawgiver. I may, indeed, *injure* another, and, by breaking in upon the Rules of Humanity and Charity, I may *thereby violate* the divine Law, which has *forbidden* it; but ſtill my Sin is *only* againſt God, who is *Lord of Conſcience, Judge of Quick and Dead*, and whoſe *Law* alone is the whole Standard of Sin and Duty: And tho', perhaps, in an improper and *figurative* Senſe, I may be ſaid, in ſome Inſtances, to ſin againſt my Neighbour, had not this been *a Breach* of the divine Law, it could have been no Sin; for Sin is the Tranſgreſſion of the Law of God, and has an entire and neceſſary *Reſpect* to it; and conſequently, I can properly be ſaid to ſin againſt none but God: And this the good Penitent knew, tho' he had injured *Uriah*, which forc'd from him this *ingenuous* and *moving* Confeſſion, *Againſt thee, thee only* (and not chiefly) *have I ſinned.* So that all theſe parallel Places, which the Author has produc'd to ſhew the Word *only* don't *exclude* others from divine or *religious Service*, are not pertinent: And as he deſires to know, I can tell him how we muſt in *no Senſe* religiouſly ſerve or worſhip any but God, and yet *ſerve others* alſo, *viz.* as God has *appropriated* all divine Worſhip to himſelf, we muſt, in that reſpect, worſhip or ſerve him only; but as he has not claim'd *all civil* Obedience and Service, we may ſafely pay *this to whom* it is due; we may bow the Knee and uncover our Heads to our Superiors, to expreſs a civil Reſpect towards them; *we may riſe up to the hoary Head,** and generouſly ſerve one another *in Love*; and in ſhort, we may *render unto* Cæſar *the things which are* Cæſar's, *and unto God the things that are God's.*† And I intreat the Author to *render to all their Due* (which he fail'd in very much, by calling ſo fair a Writer as Dr. *Waterland, haughty Man) Tribute to whom Tribute is due, Cuſtom to whom Cuſtom, Fear to whom*

 Fear,

* Lev. xix. 32. † Matth. xxii. 21.

Fear, and Honour to whom Honour; and I will add, *divine Worſhip*, which is only *ſupreme*, and admits of *no Degrees nor Sorts*, to Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, the *true*, the *great*, the *mighty* God; *for thou ſhalt worſhip the Lord thy God, and him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* And I am ſatisfy'd this Reply of our Lord's to Satan can't otherwiſe be interpreted, than to be excluſive of all *other* Beings whatever from religious Worſhip; for the Reaſon he gives for refuſing, was not *that he was a bad Spirit, an Enemy to God, or that it was not commanded, or that Satan had no ſuch Authority as he pretended to; and ſo it could not ultimately redound to the Glory of God,** as the Author ſurmiſes. No, this is all Fallacy and a Blind, the direct and ſole Reaſon is, that all Manner of religious Worſhip *belongs* to God alone; *him only ſhalt thou ſerve.* This Word *only* is ſo puzzling, ſo diametrically oppoſite to all that can be advanc'd for worſhiping any beſides God, that none of our Adverſaries know *how to deal* with it. Mr. *Emlyn*, to do him Juſtice, as ſharp and ingenious a Writer as ever dipp'd Pen in the Controverſy, ſeems inclinable to drop it, as no part of Revelation; for ſpeaking of Chriſt's refuſing to do Homage to Satan, becauſe an open Foe to God; "there-"fore (ſays he) Chriſt rejects it, by proving that we "muſt worſhip and ſerve God, which is all that the "Text cited by him ſays, *Deut.* vi. 13. (tho' the *Septua-*"*gint* had added the Word *only* afterwards, which the "Evangeliſt in groſs repeats) for the Obligation to ſerve "God as his Subjects, is reaſon enough upon which to "refuſe doing Homage to an Enemy."† But can this Gentleman, with any *Fairneſs*, expunge the Word *only*, when 'tis the *Expreſſion* of our Lord himſelf, who being *the Lord God of the holy Prophets*, and by whoſe Spirit the Scriptures were indited, muſt certainly know their Meaning? Nay, the Words themſelves, cited from *Deut.* vi. 13.

* Unity, p. 53. † Tract. 2. p. 101.

vi. 13. to which he refers us, compar'd with the next Verse, shew it: They are as follow; *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, and serve him, and shalt swear by his Name.* Ver. 14. *Ye shall not go after other Gods, of the Gods of the People which are round about you; for the Lord thy God is a jealous God.* These Words are spoken, as Mr. *Emlyn* confesses, of *divine* Worship, and the Prohibition *of not going after other Gods* evidently demonstrates, that *God only* is the Object of it. 'Tis true, there is an Alteration in the Phrase of the two Texts: In *Deuteronomy* it runs thus, *Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God*; and in *Matthew*, *Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God*; which intimates to us plainly, that Christ did not *confine* himself to the bare Words of Scripture, but gives an Exposition agreeable to *the Sense* of it; which may convince us, that we ought not to be ty'd so *strictly* to the *Words*, as to the *Meaning* of the sacred Writings; since otherwise all our *Sermons* and *Commentaries*, and even *Translations*, might be condemn'd as idle Additions to the inspir'd Volume, and nothing but the pure native *Hebrew* and *Greek* should be receiv'd as containing the Mind of God; and so all those, who are ignorant of the Idiom, the Force, and Beauty of these Languages, must be contented to be also ignorant of his blessed Will; and of what use then are our Bibles? But this by the way. Christ having thus, in his repulsing the Devil, cited the *true* Sense of a Scripture Passage, and surely we must allow him to be a *proper Judge*, tho' it be own'd that *fallible* Men may err, the Word *only* can't be *explain'd away* by all the Art and Skill of Criticks: Nay, supposing any of these Gentlemen should find out some old *Greek* Copy or other, in which this *formidable little Word only* was raz'd, or omitted (tho' nothing of this was ever pretended to, that I know of) the first of *Sam.* vii. 3. must at last decide the Matter in Favour of our retaining it; *And* Samuel *spake unto all the House of* Israel, *saying, if ye do return unto the Lord with all your Hearts, then put away the strange Gods, and* Ashtaroth

from among you, and prepare your Hearts unto the Lord ועבדהו לבדו *and ſerve him only.* This can't be pretended to be *an Addition of the Septuagint*, ſeeing 'tis the original Text; and more of the like might be produc'd, if there was occaſion; nor can it ever be thought the Evangeliſt would *dare* to repeat it thus *in groſs*, unleſs they were the Words of our Lord himſelf, and the *genuine* and *only* Senſe of the Place. And add to this, the New Teſtament having the *Sanction* of the divine Authority, as well as the Old, and Mr. *Emlyn* receiving it as the Rule of his Faith, can't, with any tolerable Excuſe, free himſelf from taking away from the Word of God. Finally then, in Anſwer to that groundleſs Innuendo of the Author of *Unity*, *That they, who worſhip the Son as ſupreme God, make him another ultimate Object of Worſhip, contrary to the Command*; * I offer this, and by divine Aſſiſtance will maintain it, that we do not make *two Objects* of Worſhip; becauſe we believe and confeſs it, not in Corners, that Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, is *the one true ſupreme Being*, the *only*, as well as the *ultimate* Object of Worſhip; and that our bleſſed Lord is not to be worſhip'd as Mediator, but as *equal* to the Father, even as God over all bleſſed for ever. And this ſacred Doctrine, as ſtated and defended againſt the Fallacies and Doublings of this anonymous Author, if it may rouſe better Hands to the Enquiry, I make no doubt, will at laſt prevail, and be triumphant, it being *interwoven* in the entire Syſtem of Chriſtianity, *eſſential* to it, and what principally *diſtinguiſhes* it from all other Inſtitutes of Religion.

---

* Page 54.

CHAP.

CHAP. VIII.

The Neceſſity of believing the Deity *of our bleſſed Lord and Saviour; which will appear to be firmly eſtabliſh'd, by conſidering him as being the* Quickner *of dead Sinners to a Life of Righteouſneſs; his being the Source and* Fountain of Life, *as the Father* hath Life in himſelf; *his auguſt* Manner *of appearing to judge the World; his raiſing the Dead at the laſt Day; and paſſing a final and* irrepealable *Sentence on Men and Devils. The whole being an Explanation of ſeveral Verſes in the 5th of* John, *refer'd to by the Author of the* Appendix.

HAVING finiſh'd my Remarks on the *Unity*, and touch'd upon his *Reply to Dr.* Waterland's *Preface*, as far as was *neceſſary*, concerning the *Object* of divine Worſhip, *&c.* which the 23d Verſe of the 5th of *John*, refer'd to by the Author of the *Appendix*, very naturally led me to diſcuſs, I am at length brought, as I propos'd, to place the following Verſes in a proper View, by which the Dignity and Godhead of the great Redeemer of the World will, I hope, be more fully diſplay'd and confirm'd.

Ver. 24. *Verily, verily, I ſay unto you, he that heareth my Word, and believeth on him that ſent me, hath everlaſting Life, and ſhall not come into Condemnation; but is paſſed from Death to Life.*

If the Phraſe, *he that heareth my Word*, points out our Obedience to the Goſpel of Chriſt, as the only Rule of Life, and the Standard of Sin and Duty, by which we ſhall

ſhall all be try'd and judg'd, as ſome Expoſitors think, 'tis no weak Confirmation of the Equality of the Son to the Father; for this ſhews, that as God the Father *gave the Law* under the *Jewiſh* Diſpenſation, guarded with Sanctions of Life and Death; ſo God the Son *gave the Goſpel* (which was the fulfilling of the Law) under the preſent Oeconomy, that whoſoever hears, ſo as to obey it, ſhall have Life everlaſting: And therefore he ſays, *He that heareth my Word*; whereas the Prophets introduce all their Meſſages from God to the People, with *Thus ſaith the Lord*; an Intimation that Chriſt Jeſus is *ſole* Lawgiver, by hearkening to whom we believe on him *alſo* that ſent him, as we *aſſent* to the *Truth* of his *Teſtimony* concerning his only Son. Now if the Redeemer of Mankind is the ſupreme Lord of all, to whom we are abſolutely and indiſpenſably (upon Pain of Life and Death) oblig'd to ſubmit ourſelves, as the Biſhop of *Bangor* hath demonſtrated by *irrefragable* Arguments, *As there is but one Lawgiver, who is able to ſave and deſtroy*, Jam. iv. 12. 'tis eaſy to infer that our bleſſed Lord, and he alone (not excluſive of the Father and the Holy Ghoſt) is the only Lawgiver of Chriſtians, *and, as King of the Church, ſole Judge of his Subjects, in all Points relating to the Favour or Diſpleaſure of Almighty God*; for God alone can give Laws to the Conſcience; he who alone *ſearches* the Heart, can judge of the Sincerity of our Obedience to him; which, if Chriſt was not God, he could not do; *for the Lord Jehovah is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver.**

In this View the Text before us ſpeaks for the proper Divinity of Chriſt, which, tho' it may not be deducible hence, is plain from other Paſſages of Scripture, where abundant Arguments of this Nature offer themſelves; but I rather am inclin'd to think 'tis *far more* conſiſtent with the Scope and Deſign of our Lord, to interpret

* Iſa. xxxiii. 22.

interpret these Words as having entire reference to the *Necessity* of believing his Equality with the Father, and honouring him accordingly, which he had been inculcating in the former Verses, *q. d.* I solemnly assure you, whatever Notion you may *now* have of me, that what I have spoken is the *Truth* of God that sent me, and upon your entertaining of it, and improving it as such, and so receiving me as the Son of God, and believing his *Testimony* of me as *equal* to him, because I do the *same Works*, and have the same *Claim* to your Homage and Honour as the Father (as you have been inform'd) you are entitled to eternal Happiness, &c. This appears to me to be the genuine Construction of the Words; and if we consult other Scriptures, they *will concur to* favour it, as *Matth.* xvi. 16, &c. where, when *Peter* had made that noble and brave Confession, *Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God*, our Saviour replies, *Blessed art thou*, Simon Barjona; *for Flesh and Blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in Heaven. I say also unto thee, that thou art* Peter, *and upon this Rock* (meaning that Truth which *Peter* had confessed, his being the Son of the living God, which is the solid and unshaken Foundation of the Christian Religion) *I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it.* That this Rock is not the Person of *Peter*, or his *Successors* the Popes of *Rome*, has been very strenuously maintain'd by the *Generality* of Protestant Writers; the Objections of the Papists may be seen refuted, and this Construction established by the *learned Spanheim* on the Place.* And if Christ be not the Son of God, as a late Expositor observes, "Christiani-
"ty is a Cheat, and the Church is a mere Chimera;
"our Preaching is vain, and you are yet in your Sins.
"Take away the Faith and Confession of this Truth
"from any particular Church, and it ceaseth to be a
"Part

* Fred. Spanh. Vindic. Bibl. Lib. 3. loc. 1.

" Part of Chriſt's Church, and relaxeth to the State and " Character of Infidelity. This is *articulus ſtantis & caden-* " *tis Eccleſiæ*, the main Hinge on which the Door of Sal- " vation turns; thoſe who let go this, do not hold the " Foundation; and tho' they may call themſelves Chriſ- " tians, they give themſelves the Lie; for the Church " is a ſacred Society, incorporated upon the Certainty " and Aſſurance of this great Truth, and great it is, and " has prevail'd." * 'Tis known to all, that good Mr. *Henry* was a Perſon of great Moderation; and certainly he would not have borne ſo hard, had he not ſeen juſt Reaſon for it from the inſpir'd Writings, with which he was ſo *well* acquainted. And really there is more in it than *at firſt Sight* we may be aware of; for to confirm us in the Belief of ſo important an Article, the Evangeliſt *John on purpoſe* wrote his Goſpel, Chap. xx. 3. *But theſe things are written, that ye might believe that Jeſus is the Chriſt, the Son of God* (whom he actually tells us, in the very Entrance of his Goſpel, *was God*, which is pure Revelation) *and that believing ye might have Life in his Name.* And I deſire it may be taken ſome notice of, that tho' Chriſt, as Mediator, is ſaid to be *made Lord*, yet never once in the whole Bible ſaid to be *made* God, but is there deſcribed as one of infinite Perfections, and the Son of the living God; and whatever looſe, degrading, and low Thoughts ſome may entertain of the bleſſed Jeſus, this affectionate Apoſtle ſeems to lay the *utmoſt Streſs* upon his Dignity and Godhead throughout all his Writings, as 1 *John* ii. 23. *Whoſoever denieth the Son, the ſame hath not the Father; but he that acknowledgeth the Son, hath the Father alſo. He is Antichriſt who denies the Father and the Son: Whoſoever denies the Son, hath not the Father.* The Father and the Son being thus join'd, is no ſmall Proof of their being *one God*; and that this is a juſt Hint, I appeal to the

* Henry upon the Place.

the Words of the Holy Ghoſt, 2 *John* 9. expreſs'd in Language ſo ſtrong and cogent, as not to be ſoften'd or eluded; *Whoſoever tranſgreſſeth, and abideth not in the Doctrine of Chriſt, hath not God: He that abideth in the Doctrine of Chriſt, he hath both Father and Son*, i. e. he *hath* God. Now *he that believeth on the Son, hath everlaſting Life; and he that believeth not on the Son, ſhall not ſee Life*, John iii. 36. And that Chriſt is *the Son of the living God*, is a Truth atteſted very frequently by the Father himſelf, and by Clouds of faithful Witneſſes; a Truth, which the dear Saviour *ſeal'd* with his own Blood; a Truth ſuſpected and fear'd by the Devil, as knowing 'twould iſſue in the final Ruin of his Kingdom; a Truth, which all the *avow'd* Enemies of the Chriſtian Faith have traduc'd and vilify'd, and which particularly the grand Impoſtor *Mahomet* vehemently oppos'd; a Truth which has been acknowledg'd by the Church of Chriſt from Age to Age, and with the utmoſt Vigour and Stedfaſtneſs defended, againſt the moſt furious and ſubtle Attacks of open and ſecret Foes; and, bleſſed be God, is *ſtill preſerv'd* by vaſt Numbers of the Followers of a crucify'd Jeſus, as a moſt ſacred Treaſure; a Truth ſo comfortable to *loſt* Sinners, ſo enlivening to *guilty* Souls, ſo ſweet and endearing, in which there appears *ſo much* of the *Wiſdom* and *Grace* of God, and at the ſame time *ſo well atteſted* from Heaven, that 'tis worſe than Infatuation, or a bare *Giddineſs* of Reaſon, for any that wear the Name and Livery of Chriſt, and hope for Salvation by his Blood, to reject it. *For if we receive the Witneſs of Men, the Witneſs of God is greater; for this is the Witneſs of God, which he hath teſtify'd of his Son. He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the Witneſs in himſelf; he that believeth not God, hath made him a Lyar; becauſe he believeth not the Record that God gave of his Son. And this is the Record that God hath given to us eternal Life; and this Life is in his Son. He that hath the Son, hath Life; and he that hath not the Son of God, hath not Life.* 1 John v. 9, 10, 11, 12.

Ver. 25.

Ver. 25. *Verily, verily, I say unto you, the Hour is coming, and now is, when the Dead shall hear the Voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live*, i. e.

Verily the Time is just at hand, yea it is now *already* begun, when, by the Efficacy of the Doctrine, and Voice of the Son of God, many, who are *dead in Trespasses and Sins*, shall be rais'd up to a Life of Holiness, as a Prelude to that of Happiness. "And of this you "shall see a visible and sensible Representation, in my "actually raising several Persons from the Dead, and re-"storing them to Life."* This Allusion of the Doctor's is very just, seeing Christ causes his Voice to be heard by the most harden'd, benumn'd, and senseless Sinners, and recovers and quickens them to a *spiritual Life* by the same almighty Power as he raises the *Dead* out of their Graves; which shews that he is the Source and Giver of all Life, whether Spiritual, Natural, or Eternal; and this is very elegantly represented to us, as *peculiarly* belonging to God alone, in *Eph.* i. 18, 19, 20. *That ye may know — what is the exceeding Greatness of his Power to us-ward who believe, according to the working of his mighty Power, when he rais'd him from the Dead.*

Ver. 26. *For as the Father hath Life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have Life in himself*, i. e.

As the Father is the Fountain of all Life, and the sovereign Disposer of it; by Christ's raising the Dead, &c. 'tis also evident, that the Father has lodged a Power in his Son, even *since he became* Man, being at the same time a Subsistent in the one supreme Godhead, to have Life in himself, ἐν ἑαυτῷ, originally and absolutely, as the Father has, being essential Life, and the *Source of all Life* to his Creatures; and consequently, he hath Power to deliver from the Death of Sin, as well as to quicken dead Bodies; which is as much as to say, that the Son, tho'

* Dr. *Clark*'s Paraphrase.

tho' he condeſcended ſo low as to become Man, is, as to his higheſt Nature, eſſentially one and the *ſame God* with his Father; for to have Life in himſelf, as the Father has, is nothing elſe than to be God over all, *living by himſelf, and giving Life* to all others.

Ver. 27. *And hath given him Authority to execute Judgment, becauſe he is the Son of Man*, i. e.

The Son not only has *originally*, as God, a legiſlative and judicial, but an *executive* Power is *given* him, as he is the Son of Man alſo, that the Proceſs of the laſt and dreadful Day may be more auguſt and ſolemn, and all tranſacted in an *open*, *plain*, and *viſible* Manner. So that he who judges both the Quick and the Dead, *inviſibly* with his Father, as Son of God, will judge it *viſibly* in his Father's Name, as Son of Man, according to that Paſſage in the *Revelations*, i. 7. *Behold he cometh with Clouds, and every Eye ſhall ſee him*, &c. *For God hath appointed a Day in which he will judge the World in Righteouſneſs, by that Man whom he hath ordain'd.** If Chriſt, then, who is God, is to be Judge alſo in the *Character* and Appearance of the Son of Man, this affords an eaſy Solution to that controverted Text, *Mark* xiii. 32. *But of that Day, and that Hour knoweth no Man, no not the Angels which are in Heaven, neither the Son* (*i. e.* the Son of Man) *but the Father.* But in order to reſcue this Place from Miſtake, 'twill not be amiſs to try how it may be explain'd of Chriſt in his higheſt and loweſt Character.

1ſt, If we take the Word οἶδεν, knoweth, in the ſame Senſe as *to teach*, or make known, as 'tis us'd 1 *Cor.* ii. 2. the Words may run thus:

But that Day and Hour there is no one who hath, ſhall, or can make known unto you, not the Angels who dwell continually before God's Face, nor the Son himſelf, who, altho' *he knoweth all things*, John xxi. 17. yet ſeeing

* Acts xvii. 31.

ſeeing he now acts in the Capacity of a Prophet, and has no particular *Inſtructions* to reveal it to you, as 'tis not in his Commiſſion, he cannot make it known; *Take ye heed therefore, watch and pray, for ye know not when the time is.* This, perhaps, may appear a little ſtrained, but far leſs than ſome of the *Antitrinitarian* Gloſſes. And therefore,

2*dly*. I would offer ſomething that may be leſs liable to Exception, and entirely *conſonant* to the Context, *viz.* that the Words are ſpoken of Chriſt in his *loweſt* Character, *as Son of Man.*

With reſpect to our Lord's *humane* Nature, 'tis certain he may be ignorant of many things, juſt as he was ſubject to all other humane Infirmities, and Death itſelf, without any *Derogation* from his Dignity, as Son of God, ſeeing his Deity is unchangeable and impaſſible; for his two Natures, which were united in his Perſon, ſtill *retaining* their peculiar Properties, the divine could not become feeble or ignorant, nor could the humane become omnipotent, or omniſcient; and conſequently, there is no Abſurdity to ſuppoſe a finite, limited Knowledge in the *Man* Chriſt Jeſus; and what is remarkable, our bleſſed Saviour is juſt before repreſented in his final Appearance, not as the Son of God, but as the *Son of Man.** Here our Lord is ſpoken of in his loweſt Character, as one that will viſibly appear; ſo that the Context *neceſſarily* confines us to explain the Paſſage of the Son of Man; for there is no *other* Son mentioned in the whole Chapter. Beſides, it can never be thought that the Son of God, who *made* the World, and *upholdeth all things by the Word of his Power, and who knoweth all things*, † ſhould be ignorant of any great Change or Revolution in the Works of his own Hand; eſpecially when no Change happens but what he himſelf is the Author of. ‡ And if

* Ver. 26. † Heb. i. 2, 3. Col. ii. 3. ‡ Heb. i. 12.

if he did not know all the Revolutions that could happen in the heavenly Bodies, the whole *Order* of natural Cauſes, and the whole *Train* of their Effects, how could he acquaint his Diſciples of the portendous Signs, and glorious Circumſtances of his Appearing? 'Tis highly diſingenuous, therefore, and very hard to detract from the Honour of our Lord, and deny his Divinity, becauſe, as Man, he did not know the preciſe time of the Day of Judgment. Methinks we ſhould the rather admire his Goodneſs and Condeſcenſion, that, for our ſakes, he would thus humble himſelf, to aſſume a Character ſo *vaſtly* beneath his own from Eternity. And that theſe Words are ſpoken of Chriſt in this inferior Character, I am the more confirmed in the Belief of; becauſe, though the Angels are ſaid not to know this time, here is no mention made of the *Holy Spirit*, who is ſaid *to know the deep things of God.* And 'tis certain the Spirit receives his Knowledge from the Son, and *ſhall glorify him*, by ſhewing to the Apoſtles thoſe things they ſhould foretell would hereafter come to paſs, *Joh.* xvi. 13, 14. How then could the Son be ignorant, who was the Fountain of the Spirits Knowledge? *All things that the Father hath are mine* (ſays our Lord in the 15th Verſe) *therefore, ſaid I, he ſhall take of mine, and ſhall ſhew it unto you.* Now if the Father has the Knowledge of the great and tremendous Day, the Son hath alſo; for all the Knowledge of things to come, which the Father hath, the Son hath likewiſe; and this might be further demonſtrated from ſeveral Texts of Scripture, that the Son is omniſcient: And would any conſiderate Man, whoſe Thoughts are *awake*, and can think freely, imagine one *ſingle* Text (allowing it to be of a dubious Signification) ſhould out-weigh the *Authority* of ſo many other plain Evidences? What is generally urged againſt this Explication, I know, is, *that it makes the Knowledge of the Son of Man ſuperior to that of Angels, there being a plain Order or Gradation in the Text, not*

the Angels in Heaven, nor the Son. But conſidering the Spirit *dwelt* in him *without Meaſure*, and he was made the Meſſenger of the divine Will, to *reveal* the Councils of Heaven to Men, as he was in this Capacity a Prophet, *far greater than* Moſes, his infus'd Knowledge might exceed all the Intellects of Angels, who are repreſented only as *deſiring to look*, and pry into the myſterious Wonders of our Salvation, and the Benefits that will accrue unto us at the Revelation of Jeſus Chriſt. *

But ſuppoſing theſe Words be allowed to ſpeak of Chriſt, *as Son of Man*; and that, as Son of God, he really *knows* all things, it may be further objected, perhaps, by ſome, *that Omniſcience is no Proof of his Deity; becauſe Knowledge being a communicable Attribute, it may be imparted to Chriſt, without ſuppoſing him God.*

In Anſwer to this I would obſerve, that tho' Knowledge and Wiſdom may be predicated of God, and every rational Creature, to whom he has given any *Share* of Underſtanding, and is *thus far* a communicable Attribute; yet it can never be ſaid of any inferior Being, that he knows *as much as* God knows, or is *as wiſe as* God is wiſe; for that *immenſe* Knowledge, which is peculiar to God, is *infinite* and *perfect*, and *as ſuch* incommunicable: For if an inferior Being ſhould be ſuppos'd to have the ſame *comprehenſive* Knowledge, it would follow that God hath no Knowledge *peculiar to his own* infinite and glorious Being; which is irrational, if not impious, to aſſert, ſeeing he is in *every* Perfection infinitely *diſtinguiſhed from*, and *above* all others. Or, perhaps, it may be further offered, that the Difference is, God is all knowing *immediately*, and by himſelf, and Chriſt only by *Revelation*. But beſides the Abſurdity of ſuppoſing the great *Jehovah* would make another *equally knowing* with himſelf, and the Difficulty, and even Impoſſibility

* 1 Pet. i. 11.

possibility of thinking that he could, who is infinite in Wisdom, reveal *all things* that he knows to a *separate*, finite Being; this Distinction will appear useless, if our Lord has not only the *same extensive* Knowledge as the Father, but the same *way of immediate knowing* even the Secrets of all Hearts by himself, which must be acknowledged the Prerogative of the great God; and therefore 'tis said of God the Father in the Old Testament, *I the Lord search the Heart, and the Reins*; and again, *Thou, even thou only, knowest the Hearts of the Children of Men*; which is appropriating, as far as Words can express it, this peculiar *Act* and *Way* of knowing to himself alone: And yet Christ says the same *of himself* in the New Testament, being one and the same *Jehovah*, *The Churches shall know that I am he that searches the Heart, and tries the Reins*; † which must entirely supplant any such Plea of Christ being omniscient by way of Revelation. But to proceed:

Ver. 28. *Marvel not at this; for the Hour is coming, in the which all that are in their Graves shall hear his Voice.* q. d. Let not this seem so *surprising* and incredible, that I, who now appear to you as a Man, should at last be *Judge of Quick and Dead*; for what I say is true; and hereafter you will have most *sensible* and amazing Proof of it, when all, that are in the State of the Dead, shall *start again* into Life, and be rais'd up by the piercing and quickning Power of *my Voice.*

The Resurrection of the Dead is such a Prodigy of Power, and so shocking to the Eye of *glimmering* Reason, that some of keen Parts have not *scrupled* to dispute it; they have so limited the infinite Power of God, by their own *narrow* and imperfect Notions of things, as to think it *incredible* and impossible, because they could have *no Idea* how so surprising an Effect

† Rev. ii. 23.

could be produced: For this Reaſon, among others, the learned *Sadduces* denied the Reſurrection, which made the Apoſtle appeal to King *Agrippa*, *Why it ſhould be thought a thing incredible with you, that God ſhould raiſe the Dead?* Acts xxvi. 7, 8. Which intimates to us, that if we have right Apprehenſions of God, who is a Being of infinite Power and Wiſdom, and believe the Truth of his *own* Teſtimony, there is no room to doubt of it; and this withal equally ſhews, that though it be not too hard for God, 'tis incongruous to imagine any but the moſt High alone can effect it; and that 'tis his *ſovereign Prerogative*, to whom 'tis as eaſy to reſtore to Life again after Death, as 'twas at firſt to give Life, Breath, and Being, out of nothing: And though this may be a Myſtery that far exceeds our moſt elevated Thoughts, it does not ſurpaſs *that Power* that has no Bounds. If our bleſſed Lord then *is the Reſurrection and the Life*, and by his own *abſolute* Almighty Power is able to *raiſe our dead Bodies*, collect all their diſperſed Particles, command the little Heaps of Duſt to awake to Life again, 'tis an undeniable, open, and reſiſtleſs Evidence of his Power and Godhead; not to be eluded by all the *Shifts*, and ſubtle Diſtinctions *of metaphyſical* Heads. And this the Apoſtle expreſly ſays of Chriſt, that *he ſhall change our vile Bodies, that it may be faſhioned like unto his glorious Body, according to the working,* κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν, according to the Energy, or Power, *whereby he is able even to ſubdue all things to himſelf.**

Ver. 29. *And ſhall come forth, they that have done good unto the Reſurrection of Life, and they that have done evil, to the Reſurrection of Damnation*, i. e.

They

* Phil. iii. 21.

They ſhall *ſpring* from their Graves, and immediately appear before his *dread* Tribunal, where they ſhall be judged (as every Tree is *known* by his Fruit) *according to the things they have done in the Body, whether good, or evil*; and they who have done Good, ſhall receive the promis'd Crown of Life; and thoſe who have rejected their Mercies, and have been evil Doers, ſhall be puniſh'd with *everlaſting Deſtruction from his Preſence, and the Glory of his Power*, without any Reprieve.

Our bleſſed Lord being the *final* Judge and ſole Arbiter of eternal Happineſs or Miſery, 'tis a glaring Conviction of his being the only Lawgiver, and God, who can thus diſtribute both Rewards and Puniſhments, and from whoſe *Sentence* there lies no Appeal. What *higher Conceptions* than theſe can we poſſibly form of the ſupreme Being? and with what more majeſtick Lines *could he* be deſcribed, than as our Maker and Governor, and ſupreme Judge? Judge of all thoſe many *Myriads* of People, Tongues, and Nations, and all thoſe Legions of Devils that ſhall ſtand before his Judgment-Seat; which is an Argument that he knows perfectly, intimately knows all their *darkeſt Scenes* of Iniquity, the moſt *hidden Springs* of their Thoughts; and that through *all the Windings of Time*, from the firſt Dawn of it to its utmoſt *Declenſion* and laſt Period, he is acquainted with the moſt *minute* Circumſtances, Deſigns, Views, and Projects of every Creature, whom he will eternally reward with everlaſting and inexpreſſible Glories, or condemn to endleſs Miſeries. Who has *conſummate* Power and Wiſdom equal to ſo glorious and ſolemn a Charge, but the co-equal Son of the living God, our exalted and enthron'd Redeemer? Who is true God as well as Man, and at laſt will appear, in *Conjunction* with his Father and the Holy Ghoſt, to be the Sovereign Judge of all. And when once the Clouds ſhall *burſt* open, and the ſhrill *Blaſt* of his *awful* Trump *alarm* the Dead, then he will come in *his own* and his Father's Glory, ſeen *by every Eye*,

majeſtick like himſelf, God over all, attended with a bright Train *of his* adoring Angels, and will be glorified *in his* Saints, and *admired in all them that believe*; * and then his Divinity will ſhine out with *Rays* of irreſiſtible Light, too dazzling and *over-powering* to be *ſuſpected* any longer, much leſs diſputed. *Oh! Bleſſed are all they that honour the Son*, as they honour the Father, *and who put their Truſt in him.* †

v. 30. *I can of my own ſelf do nothing; as I hear, I judge; and my Judgment is juſt, becauſe I ſeek not mine own Will, but the Will of the Father who hath ſent me.*

Q. D. To ſum up therefore all that I have ſaid unto you concerning my *working* on the Sabbath-day, who am *Lord of the Sabbath*; and my *Equality* with the Father, who am his *proper* Son; that you might not ſtill accuſe me of *Blaſphemy*, as detracting from the *Glory* of the Father, I aſſure you that I have no Thoughts, Deſigns, or Deſires diſtinct and ſeparate from my Father's; but am the ſame in Power and Operation with him, and purſue no private Will of my own, contrary to my Father's; and therefore *I can do nothing of myſelf*, without his Concurrence, Conſent, and Co-operation, there being the ſame Nature as I am his Son, and the ſame Will, and the ſame Deſigns of Love carrying on by me *ſince I became Man*, and am his Servant, and *as ſuch* I muſt certainly finiſh the Work of him that ſent me into the World, *&c.*

That this is the Concluſion of our Lord's Apology againſt the Charge of the Jews, is very evident; for having in the former Verſes prov'd and confirm'd his Divinity, he here returns to the *Occaſion* of the Diſpute, reaſſuming his firſt Head of Diſcourſe concerning his working on the Sabbath-day, from whence he had digreſſed: And here he ſums up the whole in theſe Words, which both

* 2 Theſ. i. 10. † Pſal. ii. 12.

both vindicate his working on the Sabbath-day to be *juſt*; and their Inferences, that he made himſelf *equal* to the Father, to be *true*; for having ſhewn, that he was one and the ſame in *working*, in *Will*, in the *Energy* and *Way* of working, that he had one and the ſame *Glory* or *Honour*, the *one Fountain of Life* with his Father, and *Governor* and *Judge* of the whole World, *&c.* 'twas manifeſt, that his healing on the Sabbath-day was no *criminal* Breach of it, any more than God's Works of Providence, that are *always* upon the Wheel; eſpecially, conſidering that he was ſo one with the Father, that he could do nothing without the Father, nor could the Father do any thing without the Son: *Whatſoever the Father doth, the ſame doth the Son*, v. 19. And therefore he ſays in this Verſe, *I can do nothing of myſelf*, to ſhew their *Operations* were undivided; and ſays he further, *As I hear, I judge; and my Judgment is juſt*; which alludes to the 22d *Verſe*, *The Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son*, who being *in the Boſom* of the Father, and knowing his Secrets and *eternal* Counſels, always acts according thereunto. And when he aſſigns the Reaſon of his Conduct, becauſe *I ſeek not my own Will, but the Will of him that ſent me*; this ſhews, that whatever he did, was not the *Reſult* of any particular *Determination of his own*, in Derogation to the Honour of the Father; but in every thing he ſhou'd act *agreeably* to his Will, both *as a Son* and *a Servant*; conſequently, as he had the *ſame Nature* as his Father, and was employ'd in a lower Character to carry on the *ſame Deſign*, his Will in all things was the ſame as his Father's; which made his healing the Cripple *on the Sabbath-day* juſtifiable, and his ſaying that *God was his Father*, equally ſo, which, as the Jews thought, and what he really intended by it, was making himſelf *equal* to God.—— Thus having at length thoroughly examin'd into the Meaning of the Context, and fully ſhewn it can *no way* favour the *Suggeſtion* in the Appendix, I ſhall now return to the remaining Objections.

CHAP. IX.

The neceſſary *and* eternal *Exiſtence of the Son of God vindicated, and the remaining Objections of the* Appendix *fairly examin'd, and demonſtrated to be of no Weight, and conſequently* very far *from proving the eternal Generation of the Son of God to be a* direct *and* flat Contradiction.

THE Author of the *Appendix*, in his Attempts to reduce the Doctrine of our Lord's Divinity, as he is the *Son* of *God*, and ſo of the *ſame Nature* with the Father, to a Contradiction, having firſt offer'd an Argument, in order to ſhew our way of Reaſoning would *prove too much*; and then ſtrain'd that Paſſage in the 5th of *John* to his own Length, which I have in the foregoing Pages reſcu'd from the Rack; he comes on * to glory in an *imaginary* Victory, and too haſtily concludes our Arguments *to be egregious trifling*. But tho' he may indulge an uncommon *Liberty* of deciding the Controverſy in his own Favour, he ſeems appriz'd of ſomething elſe that may be offer'd in *Vindication* of the Trinitarian Scheme. Hence, ſays he, *I am very willing to ſuppoſe, that thoſe, who lay ſuch a mighty Streſs upon it, have ſomewhat more ſpecious and plauſible to offer; and I think, if it be any thing, it muſt be this*, viz.

" That Chriſt being the proper eternal Son of God, " *neceſſarily* begotten of him, muſt have the ſame Na- " ture and Eſſence with God, and ſo be very and ſu- " preme God; becauſe no Being can be *eternal* and *ne- " ceſſary* beſides the *ſupreme* God; and, ſince the Scrip- " ture

* Page 36.

" ture has determin'd that the ſupreme Being is but " *one*, muſt have *individually* the ſame, and not a diſtinct " Nature from him.

The Author having ſeen fit to fix on this Argument only, either *inſenſible* of the Strength and Number of other Proofs, or *willing* to ſlip them over; I ſhall join Iſſue with him, in trying the Weight of this *plauſible Argument*, as he calls it, and then conſider the Reaſons he has offer'd againſt it.

1ſt. I ſhall try the Weight of this Argument, which grants, that Chriſt is neceſſarily and eternally begotten, which muſt ſuppoſe neceſſary and eternal Exiſtence.

1. *Neceſſary Exiſtence.*——That there is but one ſupreme Being who exiſts neceſſarily, and is a God of infinite Perfections, is deducible from the Light of Nature; and that this one ſupreme Being or Eſſence *includes in it* the *Relation* of a Father and *Son*, who are *inſeparably* one, is taught us in the holy Scriptures, where our bleſſed Lord is frequently call'd *the Son of God*, *his only begotten Son*; and ſo can never be conſiſtent with that dry and jejune Turn the Socinians give it, *viz. That he was the Son of no other but God*; which is not true; for as he was Man, he was alſo the Son of the *Virgin Mary*.——Chriſt then, in his higheſt Nature, is a Son ſo begotten, *as none other is, was, or can be*, the only begotten of the Father, in an ineffable manner, in, and of the ſame Nature, and conſequently is co-equal, co-eſſential, and co-eternal with him; for the divine Nature being infinite, immaterial, incorporeal, the whole of it muſt belong to him, as has been already ſhewn. So that Chriſt is not a Diviſion, or Emiſſion from the impaſſible Nature; for he is always *in the Boſom of the Father* (even whilſt here on Earth) which denotes *an intrinſick and perfect Unity*; his eternal, neceſſary Generation then, whereby *nothing new* was wrought, or could exiſt, he being begotten before all Time, *&c.* is a Proof that he exiſts neceſſarily in the undivided Godhead. Hence is he called *the Brightneſs of his*

his Father's Glory, the *Power*, the *Wisdom* of God, *Life*, *Light*, *Truth*, &c. importing that he is *originally*, *necessarily*, *eternally* so; as God is called *Love*, to shew that he is *essential Love*, or the Fountain of all Love: So that the Son is no *voluntary* Production, that might have been, or not been; but his Existence is absolutely necessary, because 'tis the Property of God the Father to beget a Son that must eternally co-exist in the one undivided Nature with him; unless we can imagin God's Glory ever destitute of its Brightness; which is harder to conceive, than that the Sun in the Firmament should shine out in its full Splendor, without a Ray of Light in it, or emitted from it. We must also suppose the divine Being without his *essential Perfections*, which would be to *undeify* the Father as well as the Son; for 'tis beyond all Controversy, that every Perfection of the Deity is as *necessary as his very Being*, since he would not be God without them; and consequently, as Christ is *possess'd* of the divine Perfections, and is essentially, and in the Abstract, *Light*, *Life* itself, &c. he must be one with his Father in Nature, as he is in Operation, and so a necessarily existent Being, *very God*, before all and above all; there being no Instant in which he was not *the Brightness of his Father's Glory*, and the *very Image of his Person*, never separated from him, any more than the Ideas of our own Minds can have a separate Existence from the Mind itself, which must be own'd is *too faint* an Illustration of so transcendent a Mystery, as is any other *Similitude* we can borrow from transient Objects and finite Creatures: But however, as we believe the Being of a God, the Nature of whose Essence and Perfections we can't unravel; and as we assent to the Co-existence of our own Understandings, Wills, and Thoughts, with the Essence of the Mind, the Manner of which is as *unintelligible* as the Union of our Souls with our Bodies; why should we expect to be more enlighten'd in the *Co-existence* of the Three divine, uncreated Persons in the Deity? Why

should

ſhould we complain of ſo ſublime a Doctrine's being not *clearly* reveal'd *as* to be *commenſurate* to our Ideas? If we believe God is true, we ſhould *chearfully* acquieſce in what he has ſaid of his Son, *viz. That in him dwells all the Fullneſs of the Godhead bodily*; and what has the Father more? His Words, who cannot lye, methinks, ſhould be our *Warrant* to receive this as Truth, and the *ſure Prop* of our Faith in Father and Son, as one God: And tho' the Manner how Three are One is incomprehenſible, the Holy Ghoſt could not well uſe *plainer Words* to render it ſuitable to our Underſtandings than he has already done, unleſs we had ſtronger and brighter *Intellects* in proportion; for if we conſider the *abſtruſe* Nature of the Subject, and our *feeble* Conceptions of what is infinite, this Doctrine is as intelligibly *expreſt* as we could poſſibly expect. But to puſh forward:

II. The Argument the Author oppoſes, implies the Son's *eternal Exiſtence* alſo.

He had a Subſiſtence and Glory in the divine Nature *before the World was*; † *His goings forth were from everlaſting*: * So that he hath neither *Beginning of Days nor End of Life*; but is *the ſame yeſterday, to day, and for ever*, § even *that eternal Life who was always with the Father*; the *Alpha and Omega*, the *firſt and the laſt*, the *Beginning and the End*, who *was, and is, and is to come*; ‡ which expreſſes that boundleſs Duration proper to the ſupreme God alone; for *thus ſaith the Lord, the King of* Iſrael, *and his Redeemer, the Lord of Hoſts, I am the firſt, and I am the laſt, and beſides me there is no God*; ¶ and yet our Lord is emphatically ſtyl'd *the firſt and the laſt*; and very juſtly he may, being the *true* God, *by whom and for whom all things viſible and inviſible were created.* ‖ For if all things were created by him, he muſt neceſſarily be uncreated; and being uncreated, he muſt neceſſarily be eternal, ſeeing *nothing*

† John xvii. 5. * Mich. v. 2. § Heb. xiii. 8. ‡ Rev. i. 11, 17. ii. 8. xxi. 6. ¶ If. xliv. 6. xli. 4. xlviii. 12. ‖ Col. i. 16.

thing could *ever* create itſelf into Being; for what at any time did not exiſt, can never, without being created, come into Being, as was hinted before. Hence Chriſt, who is the *Wiſdom* of God, is ſaid to be brought forth, *before the Mountains were ſettled*, and *from everlaſting*, and *in the beginning, or ever the Earth was*; ‡ which is a Teſtimony to his eternal Generation, and conſequently eternal Exiſtence; for thus is the eternal *Jehovah* deſcribed, *Pſal.* xc. 2. *Before the Mountains were brought forth, or ever thou hadſt form'd the Earth and the World: Even from everlaſting to everlaſting, thou art God.* Which plainly ſhews, that whatever exiſted before the Creation of the World, as there is no *conceivable Medium* between Time and Eternity, muſt be eternal; and conſequently Chriſt being *before all things, and by whom all things conſiſt*, * 'tis not difficult to ſee that he exiſted with the Father from all Eternity. And thoſe Words cited from the *Pſalms*, *Acts* xiii. 33. *Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee*, are no obſcure Hint of Chriſt's Eternity; for 'tis evident, this Paſſage can't have Reference to Chriſt's *Reſurrection only*; tho' that was a *bright* Diſcovery and *open Declaration* of his Deity; becauſe antecedent to this, God is ſaid *to ſend his Son* into the World; ſo that he was a Son *before* he was ſent: And tho' the Word *Day* ſeems at firſt view to point at a limited Time; yet conſidering God is eternal, who muſt therefore exiſt without any *Change*, *Alteration*, or *Succeſſion* of his Being, to whom all things are as it were preſent in one fixed and immoveable *Now*, nothing that is paſt or future can be truly prædicated of him, without the greateſt Impropriety. So that what God doth from Eternity, he may be ſaid to do it now, or to day; to him *a Thouſand Years*, yea all Duration, is *but as One Day*. The Nature of the Subject then, to which this Expreſſion is apply'd, muſt *determine* its Signification; for as one remarks, || "God's begetting of his Son being an immanent "Act,

‡ Prov. viii. 23, 24, 25. * Col. i. 17. || *Jacomb*'s Serm. on *Rom.* viii. *p.* 326.

" Act, it must (as all Acts of that Nature are) be from " Everlasting; and it being spoken after the manner of " Men, it must be so understood, as may *best suit* with " the Nature of God, and with the Nature of the thing " it speaks of. When therefore you read, *Thou art my* " *Son, this Day have I begotten thee*, 'tis as if God had said, " O my Son, I own thee to be so before the World, " and I here attest, that from all Eternity I have be- " gotten thee, and thou art my Son by eternal Genera- " tion. "

I shall wave any more Passages to establish this Truth, seeing the very Nature of Christ's Sonship bespeaks his Eternity; for if he is God's own proper Son, we can't possibly think any otherwise (suitable to the *indivisible Unity* of the divine Being) but that he must partake of the same individual Essence as his Father; and consequently, as the Father's Essence is eternal, the Son's being the *very same*, must also be eternal. The Father is *from everlasting to everlasting*; nor did he ever begin to beget, then would he have begun to be Father; therefore the Son is eternal, nor did begin to be begotten in time, being no temporary, voluntary Production; no adopted Son, but a proper one; no nominal one, but a true one, begotten from Eternity, and not created in Time; so that he is necessarily and eternally existent, of the same undivided Nature, Dignity and Glory as his eternal Father, which was to be prov'd: And really the Term God the Father, as taken personally, shews that his Son subsists likewise with him; for he was not first of all a God, and afterwards a Father; but without any Beginning, he is always both God and Father; which Relation includes in it a Son of the same Substance and Duration, as much as the Idea of a Creature carries with it that of Creator; or the Relation of Master, that of Servant; or a Mountain, that of a Valley; the one *cannot be suppos'd* with-

without the other, unleſs we deſtroy the very Nature and Reaſon of all Relations.

Having confirm'd this Argument from Scripture and Reaſon, I ſhall impartially conſider,

2. What the Author has offer'd againſt it.

The firſt is (ſays he) *its being founded upon a manifeſt Contradiction, the eternal neceſſary Generation of the Son of God.—For if it was neceſſary from Eternity to the divine Nature to beget the Son, it muſt be neceſſary to Eternity, ſince what is neceſſary to it muſt be always ſo, and conſequently would be always begetting, but never begotten.*

This Gentleman, not attending to the juſt Diſtinction the Trinitarians make between the Eſſence and Perſons of the Trinity, *unawares* betrays a very groſs Miſtake, which has led him to theſe fruitleſs and too bold Speculations; for it was never thought, much leſs aſſerted, that it was neceſſary to the divine Nature, *as ſuch*, to beget; but only that the Perſon of the Father begat the Son in the Unity of the divine Eſſence from all Eternity; ſo that the ſame infinite and undivided Nature is in the Father and Son. Whence his Conſequence is neither fair nor true; for tho' what *is neceſſary from Eternity muſt be always ſo*; yet it does not follow, that the Son therefore muſt always be begetting, but never begotten. For,

If God the Father's begetting a Son, is an immanent, *internal*, eternal, neceſſary Act, it muſt be from all Eternity, whatever it will be, perfect and finiſh'd; ſo that the Son can neither ceaſe to be, or to be what he is: But God's begetting a Son, is an immanent, eternal, neceſſary Act; therefore the Son muſt be begotten from all Eternity, and can never ceaſe to be what he is, was, and ever will be.

There being no *Succeſſion* of Time in Eternity, but one continu'd Now, * the Generation of the Son of God by his

* This perfect Being, *viz.* God, cannot but be every way infinite; and firſt of all in his Duration; for that is infinite which is without Bounds. Now that Duration,

his eternal Father muſt be an eternal immanent Act, excluſive of Succeſſion or Imperfection; for as the Father begat the Son, without any Change of his Nature or Perſon, in the Unity of the ſame Godhead, their divine Nature is one and the ſame, and their Perſons are coequal and coeternal, becauſe they arecoeſſential; and conſequently, the Son being coæval to the Father, he always was begotten, and of his Being there is no Beginning, nor ſhall be any End, any more than of the Father's, *who is, and was, and is to come.* So that to object, *that he muſt be always begetting,* but *never begotten*, becauſe *what is neceſſary from Eternity muſt be always ſo,* is ſtraining an Abſurdity to the utmoſt ſize; for can that, which is eternally finiſh'd, be ſaid never to be done? Can the Generation of the Son of God, * which was from everlaſting, be ſaid to be not yet accompliſh'd? At this rate, we might argue God the Father out of his Exiſtence; for *if it was neceſſary from Eternity* to the divine Nature to exiſt, *it muſt be neceſſary to Eternity,* ſince *what is neceſſary to it muſt be always ſo,* and conſequently would be always exiſting, but never exiſt. Who does not ſee through ſuch an Argument? If but only lain open free from Diſguiſe, the Conſequence of it ſoon flaſhes Conviction of its Weakneſs and Invalidity.

But

Duration, which is without Bounds, muſt likewiſe of neceſſity be without Parts; for nothing can have more Parts than it hath; but there can be no Number of Parts ſo great, to which another Part or Number of Parts may not be added; nothing therefore can be infinite which hath Parts, except it hath more Parts than it hath: Therefore Time, which conſiſteth of Parts, can be no Part of infinite Duration, or of Eternity; for then there would be infinite Time paſt to day, which to-morrow will be more than infinite. Time is therefore one thing, and infinite Duration is another; before, in, and after Time, a perpetual τὸ νῦν, which we mean or ought to mean, when we ſpeak of Eternity, and of God as an eternal Being. *Grew Coſmol. Sac.* p. 2.

* Quæ eſt actus æternus æterni patris, à quo filius emanat, & in quo immanet ſine omni præciſione coexiſtendo, unde filius non fuit ante generationem, nec cœpit eſſe per generationem, ſed ſemper emanavit à patre actu æterno & interno, ad modum radii (licet modo eminentiori inexplicabili) jugiter à Sole emanantis. *Prid. Faſcic. Controv. Theol.* p. 72.

But the Author adds; *To say that he is begotten, is to say that an Act which is necessary to the divine Nature is ceas'd and discontinu'd*, i. e. *That an Act which is necessary is not necessary, which is a Contradiction in Terms.*

The Force of this Argument must arise hence: Either the Author must *compare* the eternal Generation of the Son of God with that of finite Creatures, or else only write according to the *Order* of his own inadæquate Conceptions, neither of which will prove it. For,

1*st*. If he runs a Parallel between the *material Generation* of the Creatures, and the *spiritual, immaterial, glorious, and ineffable* Generation of the Son of God; if he fancies the Act of the Father, in begetting the Son, to commence, to be finish'd, and cease, like that of Mortals, it shews too low and groveling Conceptions of the divine Majesty; for there is not the faintest Analogy between the Acts of the incomprehensible and eternal Being, and those of finite Creatures; the one are perfect and eternal, the other passive and transient, having a Beginning and an End. What the Creatures do by many successive Operations, God performs by one pure, eternal Exertion of himself: So that if ever that Maxim of the Schools must take place, 'tis true in the Case before us; *In Deo non distinguuntur esse, posse, & operari.* But,

2. Perhaps the Author here talks only according to his *own* inadæquate Conceptions of God:

For, in our thinking of the supreme Being and first Cause, it seems necessary to *form* several broken or patch'd Conceptions of him; and as these *several Thoughts*, like the Links of a Chain, have a necessary Dependance one upon another, 'tis impossible for the Mind of Man, as it cannot at once *grasp* Infinity, to form any exact Notions of God, but *secundum prius & posterius*; we can't well consider him as an intelligent Agent, indu'd with Understanding, Will, and Power, without conceiving of him, as willing a thing before he acts, and as understanding it before he wills it. Hence, tho' the divine Nature and

Persons

Persons, considered in Conjunction, are one *uncompounded* Essence; yet we can't conceive of the Father as begetting, and of the Son as begotten, and of the Holy Ghost as proceeding from both, without a *Priority* and *Posteriority* in the Conceptions we form of them; and probably this might lead the Author to so peremptory and positive an Assertion (which is the softest Turn can be given to it) that the eternal Generation of the Son of God is *a direct and flat Contradiction.* But in whatever Order he may *range* his own Thoughts about what he cannot comprehend, and, according to the *imaginary* Connection and Agreement of his own Ideas, draw notional and imaginary Inferences, this has not, nor can have any *Influence* upon the Reality and Truth of things; and therefore, to obviate the Difficulty which such a way of Reasoning may have thrown him into, I offer this Argument, which I think is conclusive, *viz.*

If the eternal Father did beget his Son without any *Change* or *Succession*, there can be no *Change* or *Succession* in the eternal and most *perfect* Generation; and consequently, there is a necessary *Relation* between the Father and the Son, which never did begin to be, and cannot cease to be.

That the Father did beget his Son, without any Change or Succession, is evident; for if God is an eternal, pure, and perfect Being, he can be *liable* to no Change or *Shadow of turning.*

That God is an eternal, pure, and perfect Being, is demonstrable; for if he was not, he must be compounded either of what is finite or infinite. 'Tis below Reason, to think all Finites *sum'd up* together could make one Infinite; and 'tis contrary to Reason, to make a *Composition* of many Infinites to *constitute* an infinitely perfect Being, seeing there can be *but one* that is infinite, and that glorious Being we call God; whose divine Nature being pure and uncompounded, undivided and indivisible, it must necessarily follow, that whoever

exists in that Nature, is unchangeably God, without any Change or Succession, Beginning or Ending.

The Consequence of the former Argument, that there can be no Change or Succession, Beginning or Ending, in the *eternal* Generation of the Son of God, appears from this.

If God the Father is an eternal, perfect, pure, and spiritual Substance, the Son can't be begotten of or by any *material* passive Substance, or any thing else that can be conceiv'd changeable; and consequently, his Generation must be perfect, without Beginning or Ending, seeing hereby the divine Nature, *which is so*, was eternally communicated to him: Or, to speak more unexceptionably, he possesses the divine Nature from all Eternity in strict Union and Communion, (which is all that is meant by the Phrase *Communicate*, as was before suggested) and so he exists inseparably from everlasting with his Father.

The Sum of the whole Argument, in short, is this: If God the Father was capable of any Manner or Degree of Change or Composition, he would be neither necessary, infinite, nor eternal; but he being a pure, perfect, and immutable Agent, who begat a Son eternally within himself, and so essentially one with himself, there can remain no Difficulty to believe, that his Son does really *subsist* in the divine Nature; for an infinite Nature, as it can't be *divided*, so it cannot be *extended* beyond itself; and consequently, there is no room to imagine any essential Change either in the Father or the Son: But as the Father did immutably beget his Son, so his Son is immutably begotten; there is no *Shadow of Turning*, either in the *Father of Lights*, or the *Son of his Love*, because they are one and the same unchangeable *Jehovah*: The Father begat the Son according to the *Perfection* of his eternal immutable Nature; so that the Son is necessarily begotten, eternally begotten, his Existence is necessary, and his Essence divine, one with the Father;

and

and consequently, can never cease to be what he always was, *God over all blessed for ever.* And if so, what is become of the Author's Charge? where is the plain Contradiction, but in his own way *of thinking*, and his viewing eternal and spiritual things in a wrong, false, and deceiving Light? But let us see what he has produc'd further to prove his Assertion.

2dly, *Christ being the proper and natural Son of God, begotten of, or derived from him, affords certain Evidence of his not having the same individual Nature with God.*

I have already enervated this Argument, by shewing there is no *specifick Unity*, or any thing like it, belonging to the divine Nature; because this is founded on the *Imperfection* and Defect of finite Natures only, which are capable of being *divided* and *multiply'd* into many, of which the divine, which is *infinite* and *indivisible*, is not; which might suffice as a compleat Answer to this Objection. But as the Author hath *collected* two or three Arguments to support it, I am willing thoroughly to examine them, and so track every intricate Winding. The first he offers is this, *viz.*

Because then the self-same individual Being would be its own Father and Son, which is a direct and express Contradiction; for if the Son has the whole divine Nature communicated to him by God (who upon that Account is styl'd his Father) he must necessarily be the self-same Being with God, i. e. *he must be his own Father.*

I desire the *unbyass'd* Reader to observe, that such is the Force of Truth, that the Author himself observes, as we justly do, that if the *whole divine Nature* be communicated to the Son, he must necessarily be the self-same Being with God; and as the divine Nature is *infinite*, the whole of it must be essential to the Son as well as the Father, as has more than once been prov'd in the preceding Pages; whence 'tis a natural and easy Deduction, that the Father and Son are one Being, or one in Nature. But the Author did not see this, so far as to influence his

Thoughts, and conciliate an Aſſent to the Truth; for he immediately ſtumbles out of the way of it, by inferring further, *he muſt be his own Father*. But this is a Conſequence *miſhapen* and foreign to the Theme; for our Lord may be *eſſentially*, tho' not *perſonally*, the ſame as the Father; he may be the ſelf-ſame Being, and yet not his own Father. But in this lies the falſe, but riveted Principles of *Arianiſm*, that the Son cannot be the ſupreme God, as one *in Nature* with the Father, unleſs he be the very *Perſon* of the Father; and hence is all that labour'd Art and fruitleſs Toil to faſten this *Abſurdity* upon the Trinitarian Scheme. 'Twill not therefore be improper briefly to hint (for the Reader's Inſtruction) what the Trinitarians hold concerning the Generation of the Son of God in this Particular, and then to lay open the Weakneſs of the *Arians* Conſequence; which will be an Anſwer to an Objection, that ſcarce deſerves any thing but a *Diſtinction*.

Firſt then, I ſhall hint what the Trinitarians *hold* concerning the Generation of the Son of God.

And the moſt ſublime Thoughts they can arrive at, concerning this wonderful Subject, as guided by the Scriptures, is only by conſidering the Perſon of the Father as begetting the Perſon of the Son from everlaſting, ineffably, but undividedly.

'Tis not ſuppos'd that the *Eſſence* of the Father did beget the Son, by communicating *his own Perſon* and Eſſence to him; for then they would indeed be the *ſame* Perſon, as now they are of the ſame Eſſence; and the Author's Objection, *that the Son was his own Father*, would have ſome Force in it: But as this was never aſſerted, I am at a loſs to think who he can oppoſe by ſo puny and lean a Sophiſm. By thus ſuggeſting what the Trinitarians *generally* hold, there appears to be no Weight in this little exhauſted Cavil, *that the Son muſt be his own Father*; but only that he is one of thoſe glorious three, who *co-exiſt* in natural, neceſſary, eternal, and moſt intimate

mate Union, ſo as to be the one living and ſupreme Being, according to the Revelation God has given us in the holy Scriptures. But to put the Matter, if poſſible, beyond diſpute, I ſhall,

Secondly, Lay open the *Weakneſs* of the *Arians* Conſequence. And thus I would argue, *viz.*

The *Diſtinction* between the Father and the Son being not abſolute, but relative, as there is no appropriating what is properly *relative* to what is *abſolute*, that which may be predicated of a *divine Perſon*, which is *only relative*, can't be predicated of the *Eſſence*, which is abſolute; and conſequently, tho' the whole divine Nature is common to the Son with the Father from Eternity, he can't be *his own Father*. To confirm this Argument, and at the ſame time repreſent the Fallacy of the Author's *precarious* Conſequence, I ſhall beg leave to ſurmiſe a Caſe parallel to his way of Reaſoning, *viz.*

Every *Father* is a Perſon having a Son;

A *Father* is alſo a *Man:*

Therefore *every Man* is a Perſon having a Son.

Now how trifling and inconcluſive muſt ſuch a *Method* of inferring appear to the moſt incompetent Judge of things? for a *Man* is one that has a reaſonable Soul united to a Body, *&c.* and whether *he has*, or *has not* a Son, he may be a *Man*; and therefore, tho' it neceſſarily belongs to the Definition of a *Father* to have a Son, yet it does not pertain to the Definition of a *Man*. So that what may be predicated of a Relative, can't be always appropriated to an Abſolute; and conſequently, tho' I may ſay God the Father begat a Son, I can't ſay the ſame *abſolutely* with any Propriety of the divine Eſſence: And tho' we plead that the whole divine Nature muſt be aſcrib'd eternally to the Son, with all its eſſential Properties, and therefore he is one eſſentially with his Father; yet he can't be therefore his own Father, becauſe there is an *undeniable* perſonal, relative Diſtinction, *viz.* that of *Paternity* and *Filiation*, which makes it proper to

the *Father* to beget, and the *Son* to be begotten, which are Characters and Properties not applicable to the divine Eſſence, barely and abſtractly conſider'd as ſuch, but only to the divine Perſons, who *mutually* ſubſiſt for ever in one glorious Godhead.

Thus much to repreſent the Invalidity of the Author's Objection, that if the Son *has the whole divine Nature, he muſt be his own Father*; which he imagines ſo impregnable a Difficulty, that he ventures to pull off the Maſk entirely, and, without any Colourings or Diſguiſes, aſſerts in the next Words, *viz.*

That this Argument holds good, whether we ſuppoſe his Generation to have been from Eternity, or in Time, free or neceſſary.

But, by his Leave, it will not hold, if we conſider his Generation neceſſary and eternal, as has been ſhewn, much leſs if we conceive it *in Time*, and *free*; for 'tis ſubverting all our Notions of God, and *nullifying* the Nature and Reaſon of things, to ſuppoſe that he, whoſe Eſſence is infinite, and uncompounded, and indiviſible, ſhould communicate his whole divine Nature, *ad extra*, to any finite limited temporary Being. How impoſſible a thing for the whole *immenſe* divine Nature to be imparted to a finite Being, and what is boundleſs, at length to ſubſiſt in a limited Subject? This is really a wild Ramble of Thought, which the Author himſelf ſeems to recoil at, and therefore *glides* off in the dark, without ſpeaking one Word to it more, and fixes only on the firſt Suppoſition, that the Generation is neceſſary.

Eſpecially, ſays he, *if we ſuppoſe the Generation to have been neceſſary, muſt the very Act of begetting himſelf have been the Son's Act; becauſe if this Act be neceſſary to the divine Nature, it muſt have been derived to him, together with it, and its other eſſential Perfections.* †

This

† Append. p. 37.

This is ſtill a confuſed way of *mixing* perſonal and eſſential Characters together, and will ſerve no valuable End at all; for tho' it be allowed to be neceſſary to the Father to beget, which we even contend for, 'tis as conſidering him in that *Relation* of a Father, who is alſo God; and not abſolutely as God, *ſuperceding* his Relation; and conſequently, this can't be the Son's Act, as the Author would inſinuate: Nor can *it be deriv'd to him with the divine Nature, and its other eſſential Properties*, it being no *eſſential* Property in God to beget a Son, but only *perſonal* and *relative* as Father, any more than 'tis eſſential to a Man, *as a Man*, to have a Son *without being a Father*, the Abſurdity of which has been already laid open. And this brings me fairly to try the Edge of the Author's next Argument, which being juſt of the ſame Strain and Size as the reſt, I humbly conceive, whatever others may, that 'tis far from being unanſwerable.

2dly, *Becauſe if the Son have one common Being with the Father, the ſelf-ſame individual Nature muſt be derived and underived, begotten and unbegotten; which is as much a Contradiction, as to ſay that the ſelf-ſame thing is and is not at the ſame time.*

To what prodigious and unaccountable Lengths will falſe Principles hurry Men, even to the moſt broken Deductions, that have no more Tie or Coherence than Ropes of Sand? What! becauſe Father and Son ſubſiſt in one divine Eſſence, which is eternal, perfect, and unchangeable, muſt it thence follow that this Eſſence, which remains *ever pure and undivided*, muſt be deriv'd and underiv'd? Is the divine Nature divided, becauſe the Son is from Eternity, without any Beginning or Change, begotten by the Perſon of the Father, and not by his Eſſence, which is from everlaſting *abſolutely the ſame* in Father and Son? Hence I conceive, when 'tis ſaid in the *Nicene* Creed, that the Son is God of God, the Word *God* can't be taken *eſſentially*, as if God the Father had begotten *another God*, diſtinct and ſeparate from himſelf;

that would plainly be making two Gods; but *perſonally* to ſignify that the Son, who is another Perſon, *is alſo God*, ſubſiſting in one and the ſame Eſſence: Or elſe it might be to ſhew that he was not begotten out of the divine Eſſence, as all the *Creatures* are who are produc'd *out* of nothing. To repreſent, therefore, how inconcluſive the Author's way of Reaſoning is, I ſhall advance an Argument that will overthrow his whole Plea. And that is;

If the divine Eſſence, conſidered *abſolutely* in itſelf, neither begets nor is begotten, produces or is produc'd, 'tis no Contradiction to ſay the Son has one common Being with the Father, tho', *as a Son*, he was begotten by the Perſon of the Father, ſeeing 'twas in the divine Eſſence, which is for ever underiv'd and unbegotten.

Should there be any ſuch Difference between the Father and Son, with regard to the abſolute Eſſence of the Deity, as that the Eſſence of the one ſhould be produc'd by the Eſſence of the other, then the divine Being would not be *ſimply* one; becauſe this would plainly ſubvert the perfect Unity of their *one* divine Nature, and neceſſarily introduce *two ſeparate Beings*, or Gods: But as the Godhead is one, not to be *compar'd* with any other; *For to whom will ye liken God?* * or *What Likeneſs will ye compare unto him?*† and Father and Son ſubſiſting eternally in the divine Nature, 'tis impoſſible to ſuppoſe that one and the ſame Godhead could be produc'd of itſelf, *i. e.* be before and after itſelf. Seeing then that the divine Being is the one abſolute independent firſt Cauſe, I conclude, that the Eſſence of the Father doth not beget the Eſſence of the Son; but conſiſtent both with the Unity of the divine Nature, and the eternal Generation of the Son, with humble Deference I aſſert, that the Perſon of the Father begat, *from everlaſting*, in an ineffable

* Acts xvii. 29. † Iſa. xl. 18.

effable Manner, the Person of the Son; and not that his Essence begat the Essence of the Son; for that certainly cannot be said to beget or be begotten, which is only inseparably and undividedly *communicated* by *Generation* (if I may use so improper a Term) which I take to be the peculiar way of subsisting, the Son has from Eternity in the divine Nature, and what *distinguishes* him from the Father: And this Manner of Subsistence is entirely consonant to the Unity of the Godhead, which being infinitely perfect and *unchangeable*, the great Jehovah can have *no other Manner of Being, or Subsisting, than what he has and always had*; and therefore his divine Nature is as impossible to be divided, or *multiply'd* into two or three Persons, as it is in one single undivided Person; because 'tis infinite and indivisible. So that the divine Nature, which the Son of God possesses by necessary and eternal Generation, is the Nature of the Son absolutely consider'd, as well as the Father, equally *underiv'd* and unbegotten; 'tis the same Nature, and of the same eternal Duration as the Father's, *of itself*, independent and necessarily existent; and therefore our blessed Lord, in his highest Character, may be said, with the utmost Propriety, to be αὐτοθεός, God of himself, *the Alpha and Omega, the First and the Last, the Beginning and the End*, the *true* and *great* God, as the Scriptures represent him, *who is* and *was, and is to* come, *the Almighty*.

This, I presume, is a sufficient Solution to the Author's Objection; and if it was duly consider'd, I am apt to believe, many of the *Fathers* Writings would appear more consistent, and the Difficulties objected against the Generation of the Son of God, in a great Measure, dissipated; for I observ'd several Passages, in perusing the Earl of *Nottingham*'s learned Piece, which I conceive Mr. *Whiston* has mistaken the true Sense of, and therefore has been led to fasten a wrong Meaning on them, whilst the genuine Design of the Authors escap'd his Notice,

Notice, by his not *attending* to this neceſſary Diſtinction. I come now to the Author's laſt Argument.

3dly, *If Chriſt be the proper Son of God, begotten of, or derived from him, whether in a common or peculiar way, in Time, or from Eternity, he cannot be a ſelf-exiſtent neceſſary Being; becauſe the ſelf-exiſtent Being is only of himſelf, and has not his Eſſence from another: And if, becauſe he is the Son of God, he cannot be a ſelf-exiſtent neceſſary Being, 'tis evident that he is not the ſame in Eſſence, or the ſame Being with the ſelf-exiſtent neceſſary Being; unleſs the ſelf-exiſtent Being can be ſelf-exiſtent and not ſelf-exiſtent, neceſſary and not neceſſary. And I will add further, that not being ſelf-exiſtent, nor, conſequently, independent, he muſt be ſpecifically diſtinct from the ſelf exiſtent independent Being.**

The Author ſeems here to flatter himſelf that he has at laſt *work'd* up a Demonſtration; but the Miſery of it is, the whole Argument has no *Footing* to reſt on.

If Chriſt, ſays he, *be the proper Son of God, begotten of him in Time, or from Eternity, he cannot be a ſelf-exiſtent neceſſary Being.*

None, that I know of, can queſtion it, if only begotten *in Time*, as the Author ſuggeſts: 'Tis almoſt ſelf-evident, that a ſelf-exiſtent neceſſary Being muſt be an eternal Being; for how can that Being have any Beginning or Cauſe, the Neceſſity of whoſe Exiſtence is in himſelf? So that there is no need to prove this by any Medium; nor can I conceive any Reaſon for ſuch an Advance, unleſs it be to amuſe, and inſenſibly lead off the Eye of the Reader from fixing on the main Point, the eternal Generation, which the Author might eaſily foreſee would *undermine* his faireſt Buildings; for ſuppoſing this here, which has been already prov'd, the Conſequence of his Argument would be void; for the whole Streſs of this long Piece of Reaſoning lies in this: *The ſelf-*

* Append. p. 37.

ſelf-exiſtent Being is only of himſelf, and has not his Eſſence from another, i. e. the divine Eſſence was never produc'd or begotten.

This may be eaſily perceiv'd is what I have been contending for, and what every one muſt aſſent to; ſeeing it implies a Contradiction, that any Being ſhould be the Cauſe of itſelf, or its own Effect; for the Cauſe is before the Effect, and nothing can be before and after itſelf; and conſequently, as the Generation of the Son is not temporary, contingent, or dependent on the bare *Will* and Pleaſure of the Father, but is, by eternal, natural, and neceſſary Emanation, even as neceſſary as the Father's own Being, the divine Nature is the ſame inſeparably and undividedly in Father and Son, eternal and underiv'd: And tho' the Father may be ſaid willingly to beget his Son, as he may be ſaid *to love* himſelf, in *Oppoſition* to any Force or Coaction; yet he did not beget him merely of his good Pleaſure; becauſe if ſo, he might *never* have exiſted; and conſequently, muſt be a Creature *that was produc'd out of nothing*, unleſs any *Medium* can be aſſign'd between Entity and Non-entity, Being and Nothing.

If our bleſſed Lord then, whoſe Generation was neceſſary and eternal, has not his Eſſence from another, but exiſted *co-eternal* with the Father *by Neceſſity of Nature*, he muſt, by the Author's own Confeſſion, be the ſelf-exiſtent Being. And this I have demonſtrated, *viz.* that the divine Eſſence neither begets nor is begotten, but is only eternally, by the myſterious and ſublime way of Generation, neceſſarily, undividedly altogether in the Son as well as the Father: So that the Eſſence *remains* unbegotten, underiv'd, and *inſeparably the ſame*, in Father and Son; and all thoſe innumerable Texts of Scripture, that aſcribe divine and *infinite* Perfections to Chriſt, that declare there is *but one* God, that ſpeak of Chriſt being his *proper* Son, are eminent Diſplays of his Godhead, and ſtrong Teſtimonies of his being *co-eſſential* with

with the Father, one in Nature, Power, and Glory with him: And though we acknowledge the Subſiſtence, or Perſon of the Son, to be *begotten*, his Eſſence is unbegotten; for the ſelf-ſame divine and entire Eſſence, which is in the Father, is likewiſe in the Son from all Eternity, he being inconceivably and eternally begotten in the Unity of the Godhead. Hence, as the Father hath Life in himſelf, the Son hath Life in himſelf, hath Life eſſentially, and ſo is of himſelf neceſſary and independent.

To ſum up the Whole: It appears from our Enquiry, that the Son hath the ſame Nature with the Father, but with a *diſtinct Relation*, which makes no *Addition* to the uncompounded Godhead; for as the Father begat the Son *inſeparably*, and *for ever* in his own Nature, the Son muſt neceſſarily ſubſiſt in this Nature; ſo that *all the Fulneſs of the Godhead*, according to the Scripture-Phraſe, dwells really in the *Perſon* of the Son. As to what is urged by the Author, *that then he muſt be ſpecifically diſtinct, and have another ſeparate Eſſence of his own, as well as Perſon*; * this Conſequence hath been already evinced to be both precarious and falſe; for though it may be true in *created* Perſons, 'tis neither neceſſary nor *poſſible* in an *uncreated*, *infinite*, and *eternal* Perſon; for the Reaſon of things is not the ſame between what is finite and infinite: And though to the bare Eye of Reaſon it may ſeem impoſſible even to conjecture how the ſame Eſſence can be *undivided* in three ſeveral Perſons, there is nothing more perplexing and puzzling in it, or more *inſuperable* Difficulties to be offered in this Caſe, than may againſt the divine Omnipreſence, which both Reaſon and Scripture oblige us to acknowledge and believe, *viz. that God is every where*: And yet how hard, how impoſſible to think (ſeeing the ſingle Godhead is not to be

* Appendix, pag. 35.

be *divided*, and so can never be conceived *part* of it in the World, and *part* out of it) how the *whole Godhead* is every where! not *excluded* from any Place, nor *included* in any Place. Indeed, who can search out God! *The Heaven of Heavens cannot contain him*; ‡ *his Perfection is higher than Heaven, and deeper than Hell.* ‡ Have not we Reason then, the *utmost Reason*, to take his own Word, who *best knows* his own infinite Nature, that three Persons subsist in it? who, though distinguished by peculiar Properties, cannot be *separated*, *divided*, or *contracted*; but their Essence is one and the same; *These three are one*, one supreme, eternal, necessary, self-existent Being, of *equal* Wisdom, Power, and Glory; and consequently, independent, the only true God. And though some have, with all the Sweat and Toil imaginable, endeavoured to fasten a Meaning on *John* xvii. 3. inconsistent with this Position, they have failed in the arduous Attempt; for 'tis no where said in Scripture, Thou, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, *only* art the true God: Nor is it here said, This is Life eternal, that we might know thee *only to be* the true God; but, *Thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*, i. e. that they might know thee, and whom thou hast sent, Jesus Christ, the only true God. This Construction is entirely agreeable to the Writings of this Evangelist, who positively tells us, Christ *was God*; and why should the Words, *and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent*, be added, if our Lord design'd not to be understood to be God as well as the Father? They not only then may be explained as * excluding hereby all false, heathen Gods, which is very true; but also, I conceive, as *denying* that the Son is another God from the Father; for he is not only here joined with the Father, without the least *Note* of Inferiority; but *eternal Life* is said to depend not only upon our

‡ 1 Kings viii. 27. ‡ Job. xi. 8.

* See the Use of the exclusive Terms in Dr. *Waterland*'s Sermon, *p.* 127, &c.

our Knowledge of the Father, but of *both* Persons; which is an Argument that the Son came to propose himself, as well as the Father, to the World, the *great Object* of our Faith and Hope. *'Tis Life eternal to know Jesus Christ*; and who can pretend to say, that eternal Life and Happiness can ever consist in the Knowledge, Love, or Enjoyment of any mere dignify'd Creature? Surely, only he, who is the *supreme* and *chiefest Good* of our Souls, is here meant. And this the Apostle knew, and therefore tells us, 1 *Joh.* v. 20. that Jesus Christ is *the true God, and eternal Life*: So that our Lord's Divinity is really established by this very Text, which is too frequently to little purpose produc'd to destroy it. And I doubt not but 'tis a Subject that will bear the *Test* of fair Enquiry, and the *Shock* of the keenest Dispute, the *Scripture* and *Reason* being Judges, till Time is no more: And therefore I heartily recommend it to the unbyass'd Reader to try all things, and hold fast that which is good; intreating him only candidly to overlook the *Imperfections* of the Advocate, that so, if he discerns a Flaw in any particular Plea of mine, it may not *prejudice* him against the Whole, and the *Cause* espoused by me; but that he will be pleased seriously and impartially to weigh the Strength of the *entire* Essay together, compare it with the *Touchstone*, the Word of God; consider all the Threads of the Argument, in their *Connection* and *Agreement*, with the inspired Writings. And may the Spirit of Truth lead him into all Truth, *that he may discern the things that differ*; and, sensible of the *Importance* of the one, and the *Tendency* of the other Doctrine, he may chearfully give in to that which is most conducive to promote the divine Glory, his present Peace, and future Happiness; which, I hope, will be seen in the next Chapter.

CHAP.

CHAP. X.

The Tendency *of the Doctrine of Christ's* proper *Divinity, and that of his Inferiority to the Father, fairly* compar'd ; *whereby the serious Christian will easily discern which hath* most *Influence, Force, and Motive in it, to* promote *the Power and Life of decaying Godliness.*

NOT only those who are warmly engaged in propagating the *suspicious* Principles of *Arianism*, whose Interest it is to lull all asleep that might oppose them, and quash every thing that *moves* to interrupt their Progress; but some Persons of a serious Taste, and settled Faith, either from a *mistaken* Charity, that would think no Evil where there is *just* Occasion, or a too great *Supineness* in the Cause of the Redeemer, have been too ready to countenance a Notion, that the Doctrine of his Divinity is a Point of *mere* Speculation, and, whether embraced or not, can be of no *great* Importance to holy Living. This seems almost to have grown into a *Maxim* among some ; and I must own it is admirably well adjusted to introduce a *new* Religion : For if it meets with no *timely* Check, 'twill entirely obscure the *Glory* of Christ, and sully all the bright and necessary Truths of Revealed Religion ; reduce us to the *Glimmerings* of natural Light, and pave a Way for the moral Duties of civil Righteousness, and common Honesty, to be the *only Criterion* of a Christian : So that we shall no more see any Necessity of the *Merits* of Christ, nor place any *Affiance* in his *Blood, who can save to the uttermost*, and who will be still *precious to them that believe.*

I would

I would have none entertain *the leaſt* Jealouſy, that I am here pleading againſt the Practice of true, *genuine* Morality; or that *Holineſs*, *Charity*, *Purity*, and *Righteouſneſs* of Life, which the Precepts of our holy Religion *ſo ſtrictly* bind upon us, and which all, who are not *drench'd* in Senſuality, and the thickeſt Darkneſs of Error, muſt ſee to be their indiſpenſable Duty: No, far from it; my Deſign is only to prevent any low and *mean* Sentiments of divine Truths from creeping in *inſenſibly* upon the Minds of the Unwary, to the Diſparagement of the *Chriſtian* Revelation, the Encouragement of *Infidelity*, and at laſt the introducing of *Confuſion and every evil Work* among us. And whatever ſome may pretend in *Vindication* of ſo cold and lifeleſs a Concern for the *Honour* of the *Chriſtian* Religion, I dare ſay no *plauſible* Reaſon can be aſſign'd, why even our *natural Obligations*, as Creatures, are not *equally* ſtrong upon us to *believe* what God reveals, and entertain his Truths *as worthy of all Acceptation*, as well as to *practiſe* what he has commanded. The *Authority* is the ſame, and why ſhould we not with the ſame ready Chearfulneſs comply? So that if we *aſſent* to the inſpired Writings, and *own* their ſacred Authority, we cannot poſſibly *excuſe* our ſelves, either from being dull of Apprehenſion in not *ſeeing* our Duty, or froward and wilful in not *yielding* to the Conviction. How frequently is it there inculcated, and vehemently *urg'd* upon us, *to examine whether we are in the Faith, to continue in the Faith, to ſtrive together for the Faith of the Goſpel*; * *to hold faſt the Profeſſion of our Faith*; † *to contend earneſtly for the Faith once delivered to the Saints*; ¶ *to be found in the Faith*? &c. All which affords a clear and lively Evidence, not only that ſome particular *important* Truths of the Goſpel were believed, and religiouſly *retain'd* in the Churches of Chriſt, but the *Neceſſity of holding*

---

* Phil. i. 27. † Heb. x. 23. ¶ Jude 3.

ing them fast, and inviolable; least by departing from them we should *make Shipwreck of Faith and a good Conscience*. ‡ That we might escape so *fatal* a Wreck of our Faith and Hope, we are exhorted *to abound more and more in Knowledge, and in all Judgment*; * *to grow in Grace, and the Knowledge of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*: *To him be Glory* (says the Apostle) *both now and for ever, Amen*. † And, by the way, if Christ is, and will be the *Object* of eternal Praise, well might St. *Paul count all things lost for the Excellency of the Knowledge of Christ*. ¶ If we had the same *Value* for the great God our Saviour, all Truths concerning the *Dignity* of his Person, or the *Efficacy* of his Sacrifice, would be *sweet* to our Souls; we should be impatient, till we were *strengthened, settled, and established in the Unity of the Faith, and of the Knowledge of the Son of God, that we henceforth be no more Children, tost'd to and fro, and carry'd about with every Wind of Doctrine, by the Slight of Men, and cunning Craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive*. ††

Seeing therefore the Knowledge of the Gospel, and the divine Truths therein revealed, in order to *regulate* our Judgment, is of such great Moment; (and I hope none will grudge the Pains of *examining* whether 'tis so or no) I persuade myself, that every considerate Person, that has *at Heart* his own best Interest, and *an Eye to the Recompence of Reward*, must be mov'd to entertain such a high and becoming Esteem for the sublime and *most* important Doctrines of the Bible, as not easily to be *impos'd on*, to give Credit to so novel and extravagant a Notion, that they are indifferent, dry, and barren Speculations; and, whether believed or not believed, will do no Good or Harm, provided Men are peaceable Neighbours, and good Livers: Which, I fear, is a Mistake, that may prove of *worse* Consequence than we are aware of.

‡ 1 Tim. i. 15. * Phil. i. 9. † 2 Pet. iii. 18.
¶ Phil. iii. 8. †† Eph. iv. 13, 14.

It muſt be own'd, that the Duties of a *moral* Life very much *beautify* and embelliſh the *Chriſtian*'s Character; but to lay ſo much *Streſs* upon them, as to *exclude* the only *true* Springs and Principles that give Birth and Nouriſhment to them, as Chriſtian Virtues and Graces; in which Senſe alone, as *flowing* from true Motives, and *aiming* at true Ends, they will be acceptable, *through the Mediator*, to the Searcher of all Hearts, is a Step out of the Way. Take Morality however, in this true Senſe of it, for the Practice of all Chriſtian Virtues, by the Influence of Chriſtian Principles and Motives, and it can never flouriſh better, than by a ſteady *Adherence* to the Doctrine of our Lord's Divinity.

For this Reaſon I have undertaken in this laſt Chapter fairly and faithfully to repreſent the *Tendency* of Chriſt's proper and eternal Sonſhip and Godhead, and that of his being conſidered only as a *temporary* or *finite* Being, that it may be ſeen that this very Doctrine, which is now rejected and deny'd by ſome, and by others *careleſly* treated, as a nice Piece of Speculation only, is of that Weight, Efficacy, and Endearment, that nothing can equal it, *much leſs* the frozen and jejune Tenets of *Arianiſm*, in its ſalutary Influence on our *whole* Conduct; nothing can be a more *prevailing* Motive on the Minds of the Ingenuous, to the Practice of all Religion, in its Beauty, Power, and Purity, than the Doctrine of an *incarnate* God; it gives Life and Wing to our Obedience in this World, and the moſt ſprightly Hope of the glorious Reward in the better World to come; as I hope will *fully* appear by the following Particulars.

1*ſt*, Nothing can have a greater Aptitude to *awaken* in us an ardent and unfeigned Love to God (the beſt *Spring* of all ſincere Obedience) than the Thoughts of that *immenſe* Act of his Goodneſs, in giving his *own Son* to die for us.

God

God so loved the World, that he gave his only begotten Son;* so affectionately, so tenderly, so compassionately, and so highly, as is not to be express'd, not to be parallel'd. In this peculiar Instance of it, Love rises to the *Top* of all its Glory, and divine Mercy *breaks out* in its Brightness. What, God's *coequal* Son sent from his everlasting Bosom, to bleed a *Victim on the Cross* for Sinners! His innocent Son from the *Height* of Glory to the *lowest* Ignominy! What a powerful Emphasis, what a pleasing Energy, what invincible Force, in this Argument, to heighten our Love to him! What brighter, more noble, or elevated Idea, can there possibly be given of the Love of God! *The exceeding Riches of his Grace were made known to us, in his Kindness towards us through Christ Jesus.* † Oh the Heights and Depths of the Love of God! It passes all the *Bounds* of finite Knowledge. Could we raise our Thoughts to the highest Pitch, *could we speak with the Tongue of Men and Angels*, we could neither conceive, nor possibly spell, much less *stammer* out, this ineffable Love: Sweet, matchless Strain of Goodness! But how poor, how mean, how low, upon the Comparison, would it appear, if Christ was only a Creature? Could it carry any such Argument in it, to draw our Hearts, attract our Affections, our Esteem and Desires, as the Thoughts of *his* dying for us, who is the *only begotten of the Father*?

Surely, the Dignity, Glory, and Majesty of his Person, *who made us, and all things visible and invisible*, who was God over all, and yet not *spared*, as it swells the Love of God to a boundless Dimension, it has an *unavoidable* Tendency to enflame our Souls, and make them *glow* with fervent Love. But how flat and glimmering does it appear, when it comes to no more than this, that God so loved us, as to give a *Creature*, high

* Joh. iii. 16. † Ephes. ii. 7.

and exalted, even the choiceſt Work of his Hands, whom, after he had lived a while on Earth, and ſuffered, *to leave us an Example*, he rais'd from the Dead, made him a *God* by Office, inveſted him with Power and Authority? *&c.* In all this was manifeſt God's Love to him, that for his *Sufferings* he ſhould be thus *glorioufly* honoured, even ſo as to ſit at the right Hand of God; but certainly it very much cramps and leſſens his Love towards us, *in giving his Son*, which the Scriptures put ſo peculiar an *Accent* upon; and at the ſame time it ſtrikes off *at once* all the Love of Chriſt towards us; for if he was but a Creature, however dignified, his *Duty* to his Maker, or the *Proſpects* of a Reward, and ſo his own Intereſt, and not his *Love* to us, might be the *chief* Motive of it; contrary to the Current of the inſpired Writings, which repreſent his Death as the Fruit of *his own diſintereſted Love*, as well as the Father's; *for he hath loved us, and hath given himſelf for us, an Offering, and a Sacrifice to God for a ſweet-ſmelling Savour.* *

It muſt be own'd it had been an Act of undeſerved Goodneſs, had we been ſav'd by any Method becoming the *Wiſdom* of God to contrive, even by the *offering* of a *Pidgeon*, or a *Turtle-dove*, as a *Commutation* for our Sins, if it could this way be effected.——But a Sacrifice ſo infinitely great, as that of the Son of God, is the moſt *ſhining* Diſplay of Love that could poſſibly be given. That *when we were Enemies, we ſhould be reconcil'd to God by the Death of his Son*, † is the *Wonder* of Angels, and the *Song* of the Redeem'd: And I deſire all who are on tip-toe to *deſert* their firſt Faith, to ſpend a few Thoughts on this, before they *ſtir* a Step further, and not too eaſily *give up* their Principles; nay, I venture to appeal to the moſt *harden'd* Enemy of Chriſt's Godhead, whether his diminutive Notions of our bleſſed Saviour can produce any ſuch *Motives* to

* Eph. v. 2. † Rom. xv. 10.

to the Love of God, as the unſpeakable *Gift* of his eternal Son, one *equal* in all divine Perfections with him. *In this was Love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and ſent his only begotten Son to be a Propitiation for our Sins:* A Thought, a pleaſing Thought, enough to kindle every *dying* Spark of Love in us, and warm our Souls with a *burning* Zeal for God's *bleeding* Honour in this Day of Backſliding. If others drop their firſt Love, let us continually indulge ſweet Contemplations, and believing Views of the Love of God in Chriſt Jeſus. This, by the divine Bleſſing, may *recall* our ſtraggling Affections, revive our cool *declining* Spirits in the Ways of Holineſs, and inviolably *preſs* us to a more *ſteddy* Adherence to all the divine Precepts; for whatever has an Influence upon our Love, will have *proportionably* the ſame upon our Conduct; the more lively the *Impreſſions* of it are upon us, with the greater *Alacrity* ſhall we keep his Commandment; we ſhall be deſirous of pleaſing him in all things, and *timorous* leſt we offend, which is the inſeparable Effect of true Love. What then can we do *leſs*, than offer up our *Hearts*, our *Lives*, and our *Services* to his Praiſe, by a chearful, conſtant, and unreſerv'd Obedience, that whilſt we live, *we may live unto the Lord; and ſo, whether we live or die, we may be the Lord's?*

2*dly*, The Conſideration of Chriſt's proper Divinity hath a mighty Tendency alſo to breed in us Love, Condeſcenſion, and every good *Diſpoſition* towards our Neighbour.

How can I contemplate the glorious Excellency and ſupereminent Majeſty of the Son of God, *who loved me, and gave himſelf for me*, and not be ſweetly influenc'd by this *conſtraining* Example to love my Neighbour, *for whom Chriſt died?* Can ever any of us poſſibly forget ſo *pathetical* an Argument, eſpecially, when he that ſuffered for us hath lain us under the moſt *binding* Obligations *to be kindly affectionated, and to love one another, as he hath loved us, with a pure Heart, fervently?* This very Reaſon the

Apoſtle fix'd on, as the moſt prevailing Motive he could make uſe of to excite a *charitable*, *God-like*, *chriſtian*, *happy* Temper in us, even the *tendereſt* Love to our Brethren, 1 John iii. 16. *Hereby perceive we the Love of God; becauſe he laid down his Life for us, and we ought to lay down our Lives for the Brethren.* This muſt be acknowledg'd to be the *higheſt* Expreſſion of Charity and Affection poſſible, *to dare to die for a good Man*; and yet we are even moved to this *Pitch* of Love, Submiſſion, and Reſignation, by the *unparallel'd* Example of an incarnate God, and the ſurprizing *Scene* of Sufferings he went thro' for our ſakes. He was at the Expence of his precious Blood and ſacred Life to *ranſom* us from a *threatning* gloomy Hell. *How then can he, who hath this World's Goods, and ſeeth his Brother have Need, ſhut up his Bowels of Compaſſion from him,* † and be at no Expence to relieve him? Or how can I give way to Pride and Fierceneſs, Hatred, Strife and Envy, to a ſtiff, ſullen, and unhoſpitable Carriage, when I look upon the *Meekneſs*, the *Lowlineſs* and *Humility* of the innocent and immaculate Lamb of God, who, *tho' he was rich*, the Creator, Owner, and Lord of all things, *became poor for our ſakes*? How affecting is that Advice of the Apoſtle! *Let this Mind be in you, which was alſo in Chriſt Jeſus; who being in the Form of God, thought it no Robbery to be equal with God; but made himſelf of no Reputation, and took upon him the Form of a Servant, and was made in the Likeneſs of Men; and being found in Faſhion as a Man, he humbled himſelf, and became obedient unto Death, even the Death of the Croſs.*

An aſtoniſhing Stoop of Love! Can we *review* the mournful and afflictive Paſſages of the Saviour's Life, the *Malice* he conflicted with, the *Showers* of Calumny he bore, and the *cruſhing* Evils he waded through? Can we examin ſeriouſly into the Horror, Sweats, and Agony,

† *Verſ.* 17.

ny, and all the *other peculiar Circumſtances* of his Death; and then, after this, be able to think any Perſon, *beſides* the Son of God, capable of doing any thing that may deſerve the *Name* of Condeſcenſion and Love?

Could the *Sufferings* of the moſt exalted Seraphim, or let us *riſe* as high as *finite* Thoughts can *lead* us, *up* even to the *utmoſt* Bounds of the moſt enlarg'd Mind, and ſhall we find an Inſtance that can be given beſides of ſuch God-like Love and perfect Compaſſion? Tell me, ye *Admirers* of a new Scheme; is there any thing in all the very *neat*, very *rational* Contrivance, ſo *tempting* to Men of *fine* Parts, that does *amount* to this? Can you pretend to any *ſuch cogent* Example of Love, Humility, and Condeſcenſion, as that of the *co-equal*, *co-eſſential* Son of God? If not, you can have *no ſuch* Motive to the Love of your Neighbour, *&c.* and whatever be your *Boaſts* of Charity, the *Springs* of it muſt be *comparatively* weak and feeble; whilſt thoſe, that are taught by the *Example* of the Great God our Saviour, are more *ſtrongly* urg'd to the *Practice* of it. And ſhould it be objected, that *many* of them are *notwithſtanding* proud and uncharitable, unſociable, bitter, and implacable, 'tis plain that ſuch *only profeſs*, but never *felt* the Force of the great Exemplar of Love, who has by his *Kindneſs* towards us inſtructed us how to *condeſcend* to the Ignorance, Weakneſſes, and Infirmities of others, and to paſs by Provocations and Injuries with a *generous* Soul and *undiſſembled* Candour; yea, and even to bear the Shock of all with *uncomplaining* Patience; unleſs the *Glory* of God, the *Truth* and *Purity* of Religion, and the *Rights* of Mankind, *ſummon* a juſt Vindication.

3*dly*, The Conſideration of Chriſt's Godhead has an *uncommon* Influence to beget in us the utmoſt *Abhorrence* of Sin, which muſt greatly conduce to *advance* practical Religion.

God's not *sparing the Angels that fell*, his sweeping away the old World *in a Flood* of Ruine, his many *awful* Judgments upon the Wicked in this Life, his threatning of a *coming* Wrath, and the gloomy Fears, and frightful Fore-bodings of some *wounded* Consciences, &c. plainly *manifest* his loathing of Sin. ——But the most lively Representation of the *malignant* Nature of it, is the *Sacrifice* of his dear Son; in View of the *Cross* of Christ, it appears a dire, pale Evil. The Sufferings, the Throws, the Pangs, and dying Conflicts of the *blessed* Jesus, express the *Poison* of it to the Life, and declare it to be *exceeding* sinful: For how *displeasing* must it be to God, how *provoking* to his Holiness, that the *Darling* of Heaven, the *Son* of his Love, must suffer *so much* to expiate it? What an inexpressible and monstrous *Emblem* of Sin's Evil is this! —— Could we enter the dark and silent *Chambers* of Death, could we draw aside the *Vail* that parts us from the World of Spirits, and plunge into all the *thickest* Horrors of the bottomless Pit, view there all the *rueful* Objects of Woe, their hideous Aspects and fiercest Torments, our trembling Hearts might well recoil, and our Blood *chill* within us, to consider the *pernicious Evil* of Sin, that has thus quite undone Millions of immortal and once happy Spirits.

But all these *living Pictures* of exquisite Misery would, upon the Comparison, give but *faint* and dull Ideas of Sin's Evil. Yea, if inexorable Justice now *rent* the crashing Heavens, and flew down in a *Tempest* of Fire, in a *Whirl-wind* of Wrath, to revenge the *Rebellions* of Men, and grasp'd them all together in the *Arms* of his Vengeance, and hurl'd them away shrieking, howling, and lamenting, into eternal Perdition, all this visible and *strong* Terror could not paint out Sin equal to the *expiring* Groans of the Son of God, *who bore our Sins in his own Body on the Tree.* * — Ah how *great* were our Crimes, how

* 1 Pet. ii. 4.

how deep the *Taint* of Guilt, that could not be wip'd off but by the *Effusion* of the Blood of God! How doth this *open* the Venom and Sting of Sin! and what possibly can make us have more *dreadful* and bitter Thoughts of it, than that the great and merciful God, when he design'd to save Sinners, should fling open the *Flood-gates* of his Wrath upon his own Beloved, *bruise him, and put him to Shame, and lay upon him the Iniquity of us all!*

If we only reflect what a transcendent and glorious Person he was, and what he endur'd, we must be forc'd to acknowledge, that nothing can give such *glaring* Convictions of Sin's Malignity; nor consequently, have a greater *Aptitude* to create an Abhorrence and Hatred in us against it. He was no less than the *mighty* God, the *Fountain* of all Bliss, and yet made a *Man of Sorrows*; the *King of Glory*, and yet cloth'd in the *vile Rags* of Mortality; the *Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, the Lord God Almighty*, who inhabits Eternity, and yet *submitted* to Ignominy and Death. Now by how much the Dignity of the Son of God, the infinite *Creator* and supreme *Governor* of the World, surpasses that of all other *limited* Beings, so much in his Sufferings do the *Resentments* of divine Justice against Sin appear *keen* and irreconcilable; and the more God detests Sin, the greater, every one must *own*, should our *Aversion* be to it.

Let us *try* then a Parallel between the *Sacrifice* of Christ and an *Arian* Logos; and can it be said, or thought, there is any Comparison in the Death of him that was *God over all*, and one that was only *a finite, limited*, and *dependent* Being? The *Blood of Bulls and Goats*, and such low-priz'd Offerings, might as well display the *black* Evil of Sin, as the *Death* of such a Victim; for the Blood of the whole *Progeny* of *Adam* spilt, the Lives of all the *angelical* World; or could we descry a World of more *elevated* Beings, of vastly *superior* Dignity and Glory, and pitch upon one of the *highest* Order, the Sufferings of such a noble and exalted Person, compar'd to the Death

of

of Chriſt, would no more *repreſent* the Evil of Sin, than the Death of a Glow-worm; for ſuch a Being, how high ſoever, if not of the *ſame Nature*, Power, and Glory as the Father, would as much be *below* the co-equal Son of God, as the *meaneſt Worm* is inferior to the *talleſt Archangel*. The Reaſon is, between one Creature and another there is always *ſome* Proportion; becauſe their Diſtance can't be *abſolutely* infinite; and ſo there is a *Climax* and Gradation; our Thoughts may *leap* from Being to Being, 'till we *aſcend* to the utmoſt Stretch of Conception; but between the moſt glorious *Creature* and the eternal *Creator* there can be no Proportion, no proper *Degrees* of Compariſon, either in Dignity, Glory, or Duration; becauſe their *Diſtance* is abſolutely infinite. What then can give ſuch a *flagrant* Demonſtration of Sin's fatal Wound, as to conſider, that he who was the mighty God, ſhou'd be *made a Curſe* for it? 'Tis a ſtartling Thought; it dazzles and *confounds* our Reaſon at once; but 'tis the *Expreſſion* of the Holy Ghoſt; * and that the perfect Lamb of God, his only Son, *who did no Sin*, who from Everlaſting was without Blemiſh, and without Spot, that he ſhould be made a *Curſe*, is an *undeniable* Evidence that he dy'd in the Sinner's ſtead, as an *Atonement* for his Iniquity, *the Juſt for the Unjuſt, that he might reconcile us to God.*

This both *reſcues* the divine Providence from all Impeachment, which otherwiſe we might be led to entertain *hard* Thoughts of, for inflicting ſuch *ſevere* Puniſhment on *Innocency* itſelf, without any *regard* to Guilt; and at the ſame time it gives us dreadful and awakening Thoughts of *Sin*, as infinitely diſpleaſing to God, which not only the *endleſs* Tortures of Hell, which otherwiſe would *claſh* with the *Rules* of Equity and Juſtice to inflict, clearly prove; but the Death of God's eternal Son, as a Propitiation for it, that he might be *juſt* in forgiving it,

* Gal. iii. 13.

it, fully discovers.—That God should *awaken his Sword against his Fellow*, execute the *Threatnings* of his Law upon him, *as the Sinner's Surety*, is an unknown Instance of his *severe* Abhorrence of Sin; so that this must be a Doctrine that tends to give all, that *desire* to love the Lord God in Sincerity, a *settled Hatred* against it; 'tis enough to make us *start* at it as Death, and *shun* it even as Hell; and if so, which none can deny, it must greatly *conduce* to our *Holiness* here, and so be a *Means* to prepare us for that *happy* State *into which nothing enters that defiles*; for the more we *abstain from all Appearance of Sin*, the more *refin'd* we are from the Guilt and Dregs of it, the *fitter* we are for the *Society* of the *Blessed*.

4*thly*, The Consideration of our Lord's Divinity may more strongly bind us to *obey* all the Precepts of his Gospel, than if we supposed him *only* a temporary and finite Being, as it gives *greater Force* to the whole Christian Revelation.

When *the only begotten of the Father*, *who is in his Bosom*, *in whom are hid all the Treasures of Knowledge*, shall reveal the *Will* of Heaven to Mortals, and give the World a *System* of holy, just, and righteous Rules for their Conduct, with what *Power*, *Authority*, and *Efficacy*, must his Precepts *break in* upon our Souls? The *Jews*, tho' their Minds were as it were *dipped* in Gall, and fill'd with the utmost *Prejudice* against him, so that they had no *manner* of Relish for his Person, yet were *astonish'd at his Doctrine*, and compell'd to own, *no Man spoke as he spoke*; for *he taught as one having Authority*, Matt. xxviii. 29. With what *sovereign* Style and *lofty* Diction did he deliver his Message to the World in his *own* Name, as the *one absolute* Law-giver, with a *Verily*, *verily*, *I say unto you*? And his Doctrine was attended with that *uncontroulable* Evidence of Divinity, with that *astonishing* Success, that if God the *Father* himself had appeared, or spoken from Heaven, it could not have been greater: The Appearance of his awful Majesty, *to which no mortal Eye can approach*, and

and bear the *Rays* of his Glory, might perhaps have *ſtruck* the World into Wonder, Confuſion, and Fear of ſo important an Event; or the Sound of his Voice might have been more terrible and amazing, than at the Delivery of the Law at Mount *Sinai*, which was then ſo aſtoniſhing, *that the People entreated that the Word might not be ſpoken to them any more*; and ſo terrible was the Godlike Appearance, *that* Moſes *ſaid*, *I exceedingly fear and quake*, *Heb.* xii. 19, 20.

But in God's becoming *incarnate*, he could converſe with Men in a more *familiar*, eaſy, and humble way, as our bleſſed Lord really did (who was *God manifeſt in the Fleſh*) with all the Affability, Gentleneſs, and Submiſſions of Humanity; and yet at the ſame time with all the *Authority* of the Deity; for, ſays he, *Ye believe in God, believe alſo in me: He that hath ſeen me, hath ſeen the Father*; and *he that believeth on the Son, ſhall have eternal Life*; *but he that believeth not, the Wrath of God abideth on him.*

Can any plauſible Reaſon be aſſign'd, why a meer *Ambaſſador*, or Agent between God and Man, ſhould lay ſo much Streſs upon his own *perſonal* Dignity, Power, and Prerogative, and demand *Honour and Worſhip* to himſelf, *together* with his Father, if he was not of the *ſame* undivided Godhead? Might not all the *practical* Duties of Chriſtianity have been juſt what they are, and Men have been *inſtructed* in their Way to Heaven, and taught to render *all Worſhip* to God the Father *only*, without any ſuch mighty regard to the Son, if not *alſo* God? Did ever *Moſes*, or any of the Prophets, think Religion ſo much *concern'd* in their own *perſonal* Honour, as to be ſtill ſpeaking of their Preheminence, and recommending their own Worth? Rather, did they not aſcribe all to the Honour of God?

Can theſe *God like Characters* which our Saviour gives himſelf; can his *ſovereign* Manner of acting be *accounted for* by *Arian* Principles? Or can they comport with the *Grandeur* of the moſt *extraordinary* Embaſſy? Or could

our

our Lord, *consistent* with his Character of a *mere* Ambassador, *claim* equal Homage and Honour as his Master? 'Tis far more *easy*, I am sure, to conclude, that he was in Nature *equal* to the Father, and *God* most high; tho' he now was pleased, in great Condescension, to *undertake* this Office of a Prophet; for being the *Way*, the *Truth*, and the *Life* itself, he was by this Means *capacitated* more *immediately* and *effectually* to bring Life and Immortality to Light by the Gospel, familiarly converse with his Creatures, and at the same time stamp an *irresistible* Authority upon all his Sayings, and all his Laws, which having his *own Sanction* of Life and Death, who is our *one Master* and great Law-giver, and *King alone of his Church*, might the more efficaciously bind us to stricter Obedience: And that this is in its own Nature, and agreeable to the Design of God the Father, a strong and prevailing Motive to receive the Doctrine of Christ, to comply with it, and practise all the Duties of it, appears with resistless Evidence from *Heb.* i. 1,2. compar'd with *Chap.* ii. *v.* 1,2,3. where 'tis written, *God, who at sundry times, and in divers manners, spake in time past unto the Fathers by the Prophets, hath in these last Days spoken unto us by his Son. Therefore we ought to give more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, lest at any time we should let them slip. For if the Word spoken by Angels was stedfast, and every Transgression and Disobedience receiv'd a just Recompence of Reward; how shall we escape if we neglect so great Salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord?* 'Tis plain to a Demonstration from these Words, that the Dignity and Excellency of the *Person* of Christ, who *reveal'd* the Christian Doctrine, aggravates and *blackens* the Crime of those *who make shipwreck of their Faith*, and disobey his Gospel; insomuch that those who do not revere his Authority, nor reverence his Person, as the *eternal Son* of God, are *quite* inexcusable. Now why should the *Dignity of Christ*, as God's *Ambassador*, any more than the *Dignity of Angels*, be *pitch'd* upon as the *Reason* of this, if he was not *also* God?

Cond? The Commiſſion, and the Powers an *Ambaſſador* is inveſted with to act for his Principal, ſtamps an *Honour* upon him, and gives him a *kind* Reception at thoſe *foreign* Courts to which he is ſent, not for the *ſake* of his *own perſonal* Dignity, but as he acts in a *publick* Character for his Sovereign, and no otherwiſe; why then ſhould the *Excellency* of Chriſt, if conſider'd *only* as an *Ambaſſador*, be any more *inſiſted* upon, than the Dignity of *Moſes* and the *Prophets*? Or why ſhould my Obedience be *rather* due to the Word of God, my only King and Law-giver, when deliver'd by *one* Meſſenger, any more than *another*, ſeeing the *Authority* is the ſame? 'Tis certainly unaccountable, unleſs we ſuppoſe, as is the *real* Truth, that Chriſt is a *Perſon in the Godhead*, and, being ſent by his Father on this kind *Errand* of turning Men from Darkneſs unto Light, ſhou'd be *therefore* receiv'd with all Alacrity and Readineſs, and his Commands *ſubmitted to* as the great Sovereign and Saviour of the World.

What Influence ſhould the Thoughts of this have upon our Minds! *For how ſhall we eſcape if we neglect ſo great Salvation, ſpoken by the Son of God*? Which is deſpiſing the *Love* of the Father, as well as the *Condeſcenſion* of the Son, and *trampling under foot* the Authority of both. What Motive *ſo great* in all that an *Arian* can offer, to draw, invite, and command *our Obedience* to the Goſpel? 'Tis true, the Wiſdom and Goodneſs of God might have been *conſpicuous* in his ſending a *Teacher* into the World to rectify the *deplorable* Miſtakes Men had run into, to *reſcue* them from their Idolatry, Superſtition, and Darkneſs; to *revive* the almoſt *loſt Principles* of natural Religion, and give a more *perfect Draught* of moral Truth. But had this been all, the *Chriſtian Revelation* had neceſſarily wanted much of that *Force* it has *now* to perſuade; and the Objections of Infidels (and ſuch Free-Thinkers who will ſet *no Bounds* to the Rovings of Fancy) againſt the *Expediency* of any Revelation at all, would have appeared much ſtronger: For God had of old in *ſundry* Ways,

Ways, and by various Methods, and Meſſengers, *reveal'd* his Will, which had been diſobey'd, and his Kindneſs abus'd; and therefore, as the *laſt Expedient* to reduce Sinners to Obedience, and reclaim a loſt World, he was pleas'd to ſend a *Perſon* of the greateſt Dignity and Authority, that ſhould give *Life* and *Efficacy* to the Meſſage: *Laſt of all he ſent his own Son, ſaying, They will reverence my Son*; and to *reject* him will be found the *heavieſt* Aggravation of Sin, and what will *leave* us without all Apology. But alas! he has been rejected, and 'tis to be *feared* will ſtill be diſown'd by ſome, 'till he come in the Glory of his Power. *He was in the World, and the World was made by him, and the World knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not*, Joh. i. 10, 11.

5*thly*, The Conſideration of our Lord's Divinity muſt fill us with *holy Admirings* of the Wiſdom, Power, Goodneſs, and Juſtice of God in his Death, and by this Means *excite* in us the moſt *vigorous* Acts of Praiſe and Thankſgiving, which muſt *tend* greatly to promote the *ſpiritual*, the *internal*, and more *noble* Part of Religion.

How ſublime and *ſurprizing* the Thought, that God ſhould become incarnate! This was an Article of the Chriſtian Faith, *which was to the Jews a Stumbling-Block, and to the Greeks Fooliſhneſs*, 1 Cor. i. 23. That he, *only that hath Immortality*, ſhould be united to dying Duſt; and the everlaſting God, *the Antient of Days*, born in Time, one poſſeſſed of all the *Perfections* of the Deity, ſhou'd *inherit* all the *Infirmities* of Humanity, and two Natures ſo *infinitely* diſtant ſo *intimately* united, as to *conſtitute* one Perſon: That the great *Jehovah* ſhou'd become an *Infant* of the Seed of *Abraham*, and the glorious Creator a *weeping Babe*, and a ſuffering Jeſus, is ſuch an amazing *Exploit* of Almighty Power, ſuch a *Project* of curious Wiſdom, ſuch an unlimited *Inſtance* of Grace, as may aſtoniſh both Men and Angels at once. What a *Complication* of Wonders *in this Myſtery of Godlineſs, God manifeſt in the Fleſh*? And what a *Conflux* of Bleſſings

ſings flow from this *ſtupendious* Contrivance? By this the loſt Sons of *Adam* are recovered from the *Ruines* of their apoſtate State; worthleſs and abject Sinners obtain *Freedom* from the moſt heavy Thraldom; thoſe who had highly provoked the Majeſty of Heaven, fooliſhly and *fatally* undone themſelves, *reſtored* to his full Favour; thoſe who deſerv'd eternal Baniſhment from his Preſence, a diſmal *long* Separation from all Happineſs, crown'd with his loving Kindneſs and tender Mercies, and become the *Subjects* of his everlaſting Kingdom. Can we conceive what a Source of Bleſſings the *Fountain* of the Redeemer's Blood is? Ah, how ſoon are we loſt in Wonder, when we but feebly attempt to deſcry this Ocean! That God, whoſe Anger was awaken'd by his Rebel-Creature, ſhould find out a way to *vindicate* his Honour, *ſatisfy* his Juſtice, and yet *proclaim* his Mercy; that the eternal Father *ſhould not ſpare his own Son, but deliver him up to Death* for the deſpicable and the guilty; and that a Son, who *infinitely* lov'd his Father, ſhou'd ſuffer ſo much for them who were *open Enemies* to God; that *he who knew no Sin, ſhou'd be made Sin for us, that we might be made the Righteouſneſs of God in him*, * hath no Parallel! A Method of ſuch a *Mixture* of Awe and Love, of ſuch *Efficacy* to accompliſh our *compleat* Redemption, that we may well break out into Admiration with the Apoſtle, *ſurpriz'd* with the Goodneſs of God, *This is a faithful Saying, and worthy of all Acceptation*, fit to be receiv'd with all the moſt elevated *Strains* of Joy and Gratitude, *that Jeſus Chriſt came into the World to ſave Sinners.* But what Thankfulneſs in us can bear any *Proportion* to the *unſpeakable Gift* of God's Son? 'Tis enough, one wou'd think, to *inflame* the moſt dull and ſluggiſh Heart; and, if there be any Ingenuity *left in the World*, to touch all the Springs of it, and move *every Lip* to aſcribe Bleſſing,

* 1 Cor. v. 21.

ſing, Honour and Praiſe. But can thoſe who obſcure the Dignity of Chriſt by the *Denial* of his Godhead ever have ſuch a *pleaſing* Motive to Admiration and Praiſe? Indeed, had God only ſav'd us by *his abſolute Prerogative*, without the leaſt Satisfaction for Sin; or could one of *inferior Note*, at his Command, be ſuppos'd able to make a *competent* Atonement for it, this had been an *undeſerv'd Mercy*, but had *wanted* that glorious and *enriching Circumſtance*, the Death of God's co-equal Son, which was a *full* Compenſation; and yet all *to the Praiſe of the Glory of his Grace*, Eph. i. 6. For the Satisfaction of Chriſt doth not *leſſen* the Kindneſs of God, but rather *heightens* and enlarges it, as 'tis a pure *Diſcovery* of his *Wiſdom* and *Compaſſion* in the Salvation of Sinners by ſo marvelous a Gift as that of his Son; ſo that we are ſav'd *freely*, and yet *through the Redemption that is in Jeſus Chriſt*. This was ſuch a *Depth* of Secrecy, as muſt *grovel* all the *Spirits* of Glory, as well as *nonplus* the moſt *ſagacious* Enquiries of Men. For who but an *all-wiſe* God could have *deviſed* ſuch a Recovery as this, from Sin and Death to Righteouſneſs and Life, ſuch a *Redeemer* as *this* Jeſus Chriſt, *God-Man* in one Perſon, reconciling God and Man by the ſhedding of his Blood? *This is not the Wiſdom of the World, but the Wiſdom of God in a Myſtery*, 1 Cor. ii. 6. Were our Joys for the great Diſcovery of this Myſtery any way equal to the Theme, then our *Gratitude* muſt riſe *in ſome Proportion* to our Deliverance and Deliverer; and the more fully convinc'd we are of the *Dignity* of our Redeemer, and the *Greatneſs* of the *Ranſom* he paid for us, the *ſtronger* muſt be our Inducements to Praiſe and Thankſgiving, Admiration and Eſteem. But if we think *lightly* of him, we ſhall be apt to *undervalue* the Redemption he wrought out for us; our Joy and Comfort *in believing* will be *feebler* and more confus'd; whilſt, on the contrary, if we ſtedfaſtly, and without *wavering*, aſſented to his glorious Divinity, this *auſpicious* Article of our Faith would ap-

pear in a moſt beautiful and *delightful* Dreſs, and yield ſuch Satisfaction as is *unknown* but by thoſe that feel it; our whole Souls wou'd be *wrapt* up in Praiſe, and all our Spirits and Tongues *tun'd* to expreſs the Joy, whene'er we eſſay to *ecchо* the Angelical Song, *Glory to God, Peace on Earth, good Will towards Men.* If ſuch a Temper of Gratitude and Love has not the *utmoſt* Influence upon a religious Life, nothing can; the Sacrifices of Praiſe are one *chief* part of Chriſtian Worſhip: *By him therefore* (ſays the Apoſtle) *let us now offer the Sacrifice of Praiſe to God continually, that is, the Fruit of our Lips, giving Thanks to his Name,* Heb. xiii. 15. And what an Aptitude a warm and ſincere Heart, ready on all Occaſions to *burſt out* with Praiſe, has upon the *Purity, Humility,* and *Beauty* of our whole Deportment, is ſcarce to be expreſs'd; it binds us with a ſweet *eaſy* Violence to obey the whole *acceptable* Will of God; it diſpoſes us to *reſign* with holy Calmneſs and Compoſure to all the Diſpenſations of his Providence; it leads us to an *active, inceſſant, unwearied* Diſcharge of every Duty towards God, our Neighbour and ourſelves, and to unfainting Perſeverance in well-doing. To have ſuch a Temper as to be always rejoycing in Chriſt Jeſus, to feel the Peace of God in our Hearts, which paſſes all Underſtanding, is a Frame of Spirit *reſembling* thoſe who are ever before his Throne; to praiſe, admire, and adore the beſt of Beings with ſpiritual and unfeigned Strains of Love. I was going to ſay, is the *Perfection* of all Religion; I am ſure 'tis the Worſhip of *glorify'd* Saints, and the eternal *Employ* of the holy Angels; they ever, ever aſcribe *Bleſſing, Glory, Honour,* and *Power, to him that ſitteth upon the Throne, and to the Lamb for ever,* Rev. xv. 14.

6thly, The Conſideration of Chriſt's Godhead has a great Tendency to *encourage* our Faith, and Truſt, amidſt all the Evils we ſhall meet with in our *Paſſage* through the Wilds of Time, and ſo ſtrengthen our Hope of a *final* Deli-

Deliverance from every Snare and Trouble, and an *Entrance* into everlasting Rest.

He that spar'd not his own Son, but deliver'd him up for us all, how shall he not with him also freely give us all things? Admirable *Support* of the Christian's Faith! The Son of God *assuming* our Nature, and *making Peace by the Blood of his Cross*, is the *Basis* of all our Confidence in God, as reconciled and appeased. Through his Mediation we have access to the divine Majesty. This is our prevailing *Plea* in Prayer, for the Supply of all our Wants, Support in Tribulation, Comfort in Distress, and Assurance *that every thing shall work together for our Good.* This ushers us into the Presence of a holy jealous God without *Confusion* of Face; yea, with humble Boldness it leads us up to the very Throne of Grace, where *we may obtain both Mercy and Grace to help in time of need*, Heb. iv. 16. Whereas, without the *Intercession* of his Son, God had appear'd too terrible, and his *Frowns* on the Guilty too awful to invite them to his Presence, his Holiness had *dash'd* them out of Countenance, and ever prevented *polluted* Souls from coming near him; they had fled and hidden themselves like *guilty Adam*, and intreated *the Rocks to fall on them, and the Hills to cover them*, from the piercing Eye of enraged Justice. But now, as he appears to the Sinner with the *Smile* of a Father, with the pleased Aspect of a *reconcil'd* Friend, with all the *Tenderness* of a most *indulgent* Benefactor, and now and then affords him the sweet *Visits* of his Love, and the *Light* of his Countenance; what Solace must this be in the *deepest* Plunges of Life, to be always *accepted in the Beloved*, to be assur'd of being *heard* in our Requests for Mercy? what greater Encouragement can the most *Disconsolate* wish for? The *Partition-Wall* broken down, all *Restraints* taken away, *lamented Sin* itself does not stifle our Hopes; for the *Way* is open *to the Holy of Holies by the Blood of Jesus*, and all the Fellowship and *Communion* we are admitted to with

God, all the Bleſſings that flow from him, the Fountain of Goodneſs, ſtream through his *incarnate* Son; *For the Word was made Fleſh, and dwelt among us; we beheld his Glory as the only begotten of the Father, full of Grace and Truth.* His Grace, the Apoſtle aſſures us, is ſufficient for us; he it is that *enlightens* our blind Minds, *purifies* our polluted Conſciences, that *gives* Repentance and Remiſſion of Sins, *ſtrengthens* our weak *wavering* Reſolutions, ſtamps his *holy Image* upon our Souls, *forms* us for his Praiſe, and *communicates* his Spirit of Holineſs to us, *ſuccours* us in Temptations, and gives *new Life* to our dying Hopes, and *ſtrong* Conſolation to our *dejected* Souls in the *loweſt Ebb* of Trouble; he *defeats* the Stratagems of Satan, prevailingly pleads our Cauſe againſt his moſt *malicious* Accuſations, and ſo makes up the *Breach* between God and us, whatever *Enemy* intervenes; *For who is he that condemns? 'tis Chriſt that died, yea, rather that is riſen again, and makes Interceſſion for us*, Rom. viii. 34. The Excellency of his Perſon, whom *Millions* of Angels can't equal, is the *Ground* of his Succeſs; 'tis a Privilege eſſential to his Greatneſs and Dignity, to have all his Suits granted; for being the Son of God, and *one* with his eternal Father, he can never be refuſed; for ſhould the Father deny him any thing, he would deny *himſelf*, or *ceaſe* to be one with his Son, which can never be; ſo that as his divine Nature gave *Value* to his Satisfaction, it gives alſo *Efficacy* to his Interceſſion. And tho' it muſt be confeſs'd he doth not intercede with his Father as he is *equal* to him, but *as Mediator*, God and Man united; yet the Prevalency and Virtue of his Plea is, and muſt be, *owing* to the Dignity of his Godhead, according to the Apoſtle, *We have a High-Prieſt that is paſſed into the Heavens, Jeſus the Son of God*; the Son of God, whoſe *Deity* is the Foundation of our Hope, in all our *Addreſſes* to Heaven, for Pardon, Life, Support, and Mercy; and at the ſame time his *Humanity*, which render'd him capable of being

touch'd

touch'd with a feeling of our Infirmities, is a vaſt Motive *to come unto God by him.* But had he been only Man, or a finite Creature, *an Arian Saviour*, he had been too feeble an *Advocate* to aſſure us of Succeſs, to *non-ſuit* the Accuſations of our Enemies, and gain a *compleat* Triumph over the Powers of Darkneſs. Alas! the guilty Terrors of our own Conſciences, the *miſgiving* Thoughts of our own *Unworthineſs*, and the continual *Ebullitions* of Corruption in our *deceitful* Hearts, would have *cut off* all Hope of Relief, and ſo *ſunk* us into the very *Gulph* of Deſpair; for he could neither have ſeen our Miſery, if not *omniſcient*; nor *heard* our unutterable Groans, if not *omnipreſent*; nor *ſupply'd* all our temporal and ſpiritual Wants, and *extricated* us from all Straits and Perplexities, if not *all-ſufficient* and *omnipotent*. If Chriſt be not God, what *Affiance* can we place in his Sacrifice? the Rock of our Salvation will *moulder away* under us, Fears of Wrath will *ruſh in* upon us, and the *Terrors* of the Almighty *make us afraid*; Jealouſies, Perturbation of Mind, and ill-boding Surmiſes will *crowd* in upon us. All Hope *fled*, and all Joy *ſunk*, what will a *diſtreſſed* Sin-ſick Sinner do to be ſaved? To *believe* in Chriſt, as the Apoſtle adviſed the alarm'd and *affrighted* Jaylor, will *now* give no Relief to his *aking* Heart; the *Stings* of Sin are too keen and painful to be *allay'd* by ſuch a Phyſician. What ſhall he then do? How ſhall he venture his everlaſting All, his great Salvation, on one that he ſuſpects? how cruſhing a *Diſappointment*, ſhould his *Faith* be miſplac'd, ſhould his *Hopes* miſcarry! whereas a due Conviction of our Saviour's eternal Godhead would at once *enliven* all his Powers, put every *String* of Praiſe in Motion, and give a pleaſing *Calm* to his anxious Mind. *I know* (ſays the Apoſtle) *in whom I have believed, and am perſuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed to him againſt that Day*, 2 Tim. i. 12. This, *this* is he that hath promiſed *to deliver his* Saints *from every evil*

Work, and to preserve them to his heavenly Kingdom, that where he is, they may be also, 2 Tim. iv. 18. John xiv. 3. And can we think he would *engage* his Word for this, was he not *also able to perform it*? *Surely he hath borne our Griefs, and carried our Sorrows*, by his precious Blood satisfy'd divine *injur'd* Justice, appeas'd *incens'd* Heaven, and purchas'd a compleat Ransom. This is the *Christian* Saviour, and *none else, whom God hath set forth to be a Propitiation, through Faith in his Blood, to declare his Righteousness for the Remission of Sins that are past*. The Apostle, willing that the *Design* of Christ's Death should be understood, repeats it again; *To declare, I say, at this time his Righteousness, that he might be just, and the Justifier of them that believe in Jesus*. Now how could he be just in forgiving Sin, which is a *pure Act* of Mercy, had not his infinite Justice been *fully* satisfy'd by the infinite *Price* of the Blood of his Son? Or if he did not require a Satisfaction (as the great Law-giver and all-wise Governor, to *secure* the Ends of his Government) why must Christ *shed* his precious Blood? why must he *voluntarily* yield up himself to the *Arms* of so ignominious a Death? Could the Father of Lights, and the God of Pity, take *any Pleasure* in the expiring Pangs of his dying *only* Son? Could not he, that made the World by his *Almighty* Fiat, *that said, Let there be Light, and there was Light*, have redeem'd it with less Expence, had it stood with his Honour, and the *Rights* of Deity? Could not the great universal *Creditor* release the Debt of Sin, and so discharge the *Prisoner*, without so glorious a Surety, and the Effusion of his Blood? or could he substitute *no other* Sacrifice, than the Son of his own Bowels, that would have been sufficient? I make no doubt, if the *Work* of Redemption could have been effected by *any Creature*, God would have *spar'd* his Son, the *Brightness* of his own Glory, and the *express Image of his Person*. Or if God would have accepted a Satisfaction *less* than infinite,

finite, might he not as well have *pardon'd Sin* without any *Satisfaction* at all? But then he had never been juſt in *forgiving* thoſe who believe in Jeſus; but our bleſſed Lord having *repair'd* God's injur'd Honour, by paying down an *Equivalent* for Man's Crime; and he being a divine Perſon, that was not *neceſſarily bound* to thoſe Terms of Obedience and Sufferings, and yet willingly underwent all that was proper to a compleat Satisfaction, God's Juſtice, by his *undertaking* for us, muſt be fully aton'd: And ſo the Redeemer having purchaſed Life and Pardon for all them that believe on him, God is both *merciful* and *juſt* in forgiving them. And, indeed, all the divine Attributes ſhine with a peculiar *Luſtre* in this dreadful, but glorious *Method* of Salvation; hereby not only the Honour of the divine *Law* is maintain'd, but divine *Truth*, and the divine *Threatnings* made good, the divine *Sovereignty* acknowledg'd, God's *Hatred* of Sin more *clearly* manifeſted; God's *Holineſs*, *Juſtice*, and *rectoral Righteouſneſs* highly advanc'd; his *Mercy*, *Goodneſs*, *Love*, *Compaſſion*, and *Grace* diſplay'd. I can *but* hint things; yet let me further add, what *Wiſdom* appears in the whole? If the Sinner had fallen a Prey, been damn'd without a Remedy, and Juſtice *triumph'd* in his eternal Groans and Ruin, God's Indignation againſt Sin had been evidenc'd by ſo *fatal* a Blow; but his *darling* Attribute, his *Mercy*, had lain in Obſcurity, and the *Bowels* of his Compaſſion had never yearn'd: Or if the Sinner had been *ſaved* without any *Compenſation* for the Injuries he had offered the moſt High, God's Mercy had *ſhone* out, tho' not in *ſuch* Brightneſs as now it does, and his Holineſs had been entirely darken'd: But now the *Glory* of all the divine Perfections *opens* in the adorable Contrivance of our Salvation by the *great Immanuel*. Reader, pauſe, and take a little View of this amazing *Plot* of Love; behold a compleat Redemption wrought out for the *Enemies* of God by the *Death* of his

only begotten Son. Divine Wisdom, how bright it shines in every *Part* of this elegant *Master-Piece* of Mercy! Had not he become Man, he could not have shed his Blood for the Remission of Sin; and consequently, could not have *undergone* the Punishment Sin deserv'd; and had he not been also God, his Sufferings would not have been meritorious, and so he had made *no Reparation* for the Damage of Sin. How great soever his Dignity and Value may be conceiv'd, if not God over all, and independent, one in Essence and Power with his Father, he must *owe*, as other *Creatures* do, all their Excellencies to his Creator; and tho' *his* be acknowledged far *superior* to any other, it does but heighten his *Obligations* to obey the Will of God, make his *Duty* the more binding, as being more *indebted* to the divine Bounty; so that his Obedience and Sufferings would be all upon the *score* of his own Debt, if *commanded* by God; and consequently, could not *merit* another's Ransom; which shews the *Necessity* of a Satisfaction to divine Justice, that the Guilty might be acquitted, superceding any *nice* Disquisitions about the *infinite* Evil of Sin. What a Hazard then should we run, by *throwing off* the Divinity of the Son of God? who alone could become a Sacrifice of Atonement to reconcile us to God by his Death. But on the contrary, did we stedfastly believe that he who was *God manifest in the Flesh*, suffer'd for our Sins, and acted *suitable* to such a Faith, what strong Consolation would this afford? How safely might we trust *our All* in his Hands, from whence *none can pluck us* any more than from the Father's. Without any *Jealousy* of a final Miscarriage, without any *Suspicion* of being disappointed in a Saviour, we might *retreat* to him, as our Refuge and Sanctuary, in all times of Distress, in Doubts and Staggerings; when Sin *grates hard* upon the Conscience, and stirs up a *Hurricane* of Fears within us, we might have chearful recourse to him, who said *to the Winds, Be still,*

and

and they ceased, and who alone can calm the *Storms* of the Mind. Let the guilty Reader try the *Experiment*; let him now *rip up* his own Breast, that all his Sins, in every *Circumstance* of Aggravation, may come out in view; let him pore a little on their Venom and Malignity, and he will soon see how *provoking* they are to a Jealous God; he will see what a sad and melancholy Separation they make between him and his chiefest Good, and what irretrievable Woes and hastning Plagues they threaten: And if the good *Spirit of God* should now be pleased to *strike home* the Conviction, his Heart will soon *grow big* with Sorrows, his Passions all afloat, his Soul melting away in Grief, and his penitent Eyes will flow down with Tears at his Folly and Ingratitude, and all his Spirits will be out of order, anxious and turbulent. And what shall he do to suppress his Fears, to settle his uneasy Mind, to compose his labouring Thoughts? let him *stir* up himself to fix an Eye of Hope on any Creature whatever; yea, be it some *super-angelical* Being, to make Friendship with Heaven, and *still* the Cries of Justice, alas! he will *too soon* discern that none but the *co-equal* Son of God could, or has made *an End of Sin, made Reconciliation for Iniquity, and brought in everlasting Righteousness*, Dan. ix. 14. On this Rock of Salvation therefore he casts Anchor, resolving *here* to lay all the Stress of his Hope, as knowing there is *no other Name given under Heaven, whereby Men can be saved, but the Name of Christ*; and *that there is no Condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus*, &c. What an unknown Comfort must this yield him in the *sharpest* Tryals! and even in the last Pangs of Life, a Shield against the King of Terrors, and a *reviving* Cordial when just *sinking away* upon a dying Pillow; the sweetest, surest, only Support in the *agonizing Sweats*, in the *strongest* Struggles and *Plunges* of Death, as it opens a *Prospect* into the happy World of Spirits, and causes him to look with Satisfaction beyond, *beyond* the Grave. And those

those *who are thus begotten to a lively Hope* of the unfading Inheritance, *by the Resurrection of Christ from the Dead*,* must have the most inviolable Motives on their Souls to all *chearful* Obedience, such as no other but the *Christian* Religion can give, whose *Prophet*, *Priest*, and *Law-giver* was God as well as Man; a Hope, that hath a *purifying* Influence, that hath a direct Tendency in its *own* Nature to keep us *unspotted from this evil World through Lust*, to wean our Affections from the poor and dreggy Enjoyments of this Life; which, in the *Height of its Charm*, is but a *Shadow*, Blaze, and Vanity; for surely wherever Christ is in any *the Hope of Glory*, they can't well decline being active, restless, and unwearied, in their *Pursuits* of Holiness. How careful must they be to abstain from all *voluntary* Defilements, as knowing that all the Inhabitants of his heavenly Kingdom are *averse* to Iniquity, and *without Spot or Wrinkle*? So that nothing that's *defiled* can share in their Bliss; none that are stain'd with the *Filth* of Sin can ever *enjoy* a holy God, but must be driven from his Presence for ever. Oh what *Charm* and *Life*, what *Force*, what *Power* and *Influence*, in the Doctrine of an incarnate God, to revive *languishing* Religion, and give it a *new Progress*, if duly attended to, and rightly digested! Can any other *Scheme* afford such prevalent Inducements to be holy? Does the *Arian* Hypothesis offer any *Consideration* that hath such a *natural* and *sweet* Aptitude to inspire *Love*, *Charity*, *Hatred of Sin*, *Obedience*, *Gratitude*, *pleasing and well-grounded Hopes* of immortal Life? If any are so enslaved to their own Notions, as fondly to imagine any thing like it, let them *fairly compare* spiritual things with spiritual; let them *ransack* all the secret *Virtues* of their Scheme, throw open *all its Beauties*, bring *every* Motive it can afford to advance *practical* Religion to

* 1 Pet. v. 3, 4.

to the Light, and see whether it can *vie* with the Doctrine of an incarnate God; a Doctrine, the *oftner* sifted into and examined, the *brighter* 'twill shine, if there be any *Truth* and *Glory* in Revelation, till the Redeemer *come from Zion* to confirm it, when *every Eye shall see him*, every Heart *revere* him, and every *Tongue* acknowledge his *Dignity* and Godhead. In the mean while let us all, who love and *wait for his Appearance*, say every where, with united Hearts; *Now unto him that is able to keep us from falling, and to present us faultless before the Presence of his Glory with exceeding great Joy, to the only wise God our Saviour, be Glory and Majesty, Dominion and Power, now and ever.* Amen.

FINIS.

BOOKS Printed for and Sold by AARON WARD *at the* King's-Arms *in* Little-Britain.

1. THE Expoſition of the whole Bible in Six Volumes in *Folio*.

2. A Method for Prayer, with Scripture Expreſſions proper to be uſed under each Head. The Fifth Edition. Price bound in Sheep 2 *s.*

3. The Communicants Companion: Or, Inſtructions and Helps for the right Receiving the Lord's Supper. The Seventh Edition. Price bound in Sheep 2 *s.*

4. Directions for Daily Communion with God. In three Diſcourſes, ſhewing how to begin, how to ſpend, and how to cloſe every Day with God. The Fourth Edition. Price Bound 1 *s.*

5. A Scripture Catechiſm.

6. Family Hymns.

Theſe Six by the Reverend Mr. *Matthew Henry*.

7. An Account of the Life and Death of Mr. *Matthew Henry*, Miniſter of the Goſpel at *Hackney*, chiefly collected out of his own Papers, and faithfully publiſhed by the Reverend Mr. *William Tong*. Price in 8*vo.* 4 *s.* in 12*o.* 2 *s.*

8. Memoirs of the Life of the Reverend, Learned and Pious Mr. *T. Halliburton*, Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of St. *Andrews* in *Scotland*. In Four Parts, whereof Three were drawn up by himſelf, the Fourth collected by his Friends from his private Papers and his dying Lips. With a large Recommendatory Epiſtle by

by the Reverend Mr. *Isaac Watts*. The Second Edition. Price Bound 2*s*.

9. The Doctrine of Juſtification Explain'd and Apply'd. In Eight Sermons. Price Bound 1*s*. 6*d*.

10. The Chriſtians Joy in finiſhing his Courſe. Price Bound 1*s*. Theſe by the Reverend Mr. *Thomas Bradbury*.

Where may be had all his other Occaſional Sermons

11. *The Confeſſion of Faith*, together with the Larger and Shorter Catechiſms, compoſed by the Reverend Aſſembly of Divines ſitting at *Weſtminſter*, preſented to both Houſes of Parliament, again publiſh'd, with the Scriptures at large, and the Emphaſis of the Scriptures in a different Character; together with the Directory, and all other Additions that have been hitherto printed. The Fifth Edition. Price Bound 4*s*. 6*d*.

12. A Stedfaſt Adherence to the Profeſſion of our Faith. Recommended in ſeveral Sermons, by the late Reverend Mr. *R. Traile*. With a Recommendatory Epiſtle by the Rev. Mr. *Tong*, Mr. *Nesbit*, and Mr. *Clark*.

13. The Righteouſneſs of God through Faith upon all without Difference who believe. In Two Sermons on *Rom.* iii. 22. By *N. Mather*. The Second Edition. Price Bound 1*s*.

14. The Signs and Cauſes of Melancholy, with Directions ſuited to the Caſe of thoſe who are afflicted with it. Collected out of the Works of Mr. *R. Baxter*. By *S. Clifford*. With a recommendatory Preface by the Reverend Mr. *Tong*, Mr. *Reynolds*, Mr. *Brown*, Mr. *Evans*, Mr. *Bradbury*, Mr. *Harris*, Mr. *Groſvener*, and Mr. *Wright*. Price Bound 1*s*. 6*d*.

15. A Vindication of the Proteſtant Miniſters Miſſion: Wherein is prov'd, both from Scripture and Reaſon, and the Practice of the Primitive Churches, that the Chriſtian People have ſufficient Authority from Chriſt to Chuſe their own Miniſters; and that no Man, or Set

of

of Men, have an Authority from Christ to Call, Constitute, and Impose Ministers on them, without their previous Knowledge and Consent. And that the Pretence of an Uninterrupted Succession of Priestly Authority, derived from the Apostles in a direct Line thro' the Church of *Rome*, is a mere Juggle, and a Piece of Popish Priestcraft to awe the Vulgar, to make and keep them Bigots to themselves. Being a Sermon preach'd at *Taunton*, to an Assembly of Protestant Divines, *June* 7. 1720. By the Rev. Mr. *John Davisson*. The Second Edition.

16. Several Discourses against Popery, *viz.* The humane Doctrines, The idolatrous Worship, The Hypocrisy and Pharisaism, The Immorality in Practice, The Persecution and Cruelty, The Policy and Arts, of the Church of *Rome*. By the Rev. Mr. *Benjamin Bennet*, Author of the Memorial of the Reformation.

17. A Treatise of Repentance, both Legal and Evangelical; more especially and chiefly of the latter, which is very amply insisted upon, and all that is necessary to be treated of, concerning that Extensive Duty, faithfully deliver'd. The Texts of Scripture relating to it are explain'd and illustrated, and the Cases of Conscience arising from it stated and resolved. The Whole is design'd, in order to the effectual promoting the Practice of Repentance and Godliness in this degenerate Age. By the late Reverend *John Edwards*, D. D.

18. Jesus Christ God-Man: or, The Constitution of Christ's Person, with the Evidence and Importance of the Doctrine of his true and proper Godhead, consider'd in several plain and practical Sermons, on *Rom.* ix. 5. By the Rev. Mr. *John Guyse*, Minister of the Gospel.

19. The Exalted Saviour; or, Jesus Christ the Lord and God of True Believers. In several Sermons deliver'd lately in *Gravel-Lane*, *Southwark*. By the Rev. Mr. *Zephaniah Marryat*, Minister of the Gospel.

20. The

20. The Great Duty of Resignation to the Divine Will in Afflictions, enforc'd from the Example of our Suffering Saviour. The Second Edition.

21. The Everlasting Rest of the Saints in Heaven. Both by the Reverend and Learned *William Bates*, D. D. Revised since his Death by a Worthy and Learned Divine, his particular Friend.

22. Meditations on some Passages of the Life, Sufferings, and Death of the Son of God. By a Gentleman. The Second Edition.

23. *Medicus Novissimus*; or, The Modern Physician: Shewing the Chief Signs, Causes, and most material Prognosticks of all the Principal Diseases incident to Mankind; together with their Cures, according to the newest and best Method of Practice now in Use. Each Physical Process being illustrated with Observations or Histories of Cures, together with the Medicines by which they were perform'd, faithfully inserted for the Good of the Publick. The whole written in a Familiar Style, and thereby adapted to the meanest Capacities of Physical Practitioners, for whom 'tis render'd very Useful and Necessary. By *Phil. Woodman*, Practitioner in Physick and Chirurgery. The Second Edition.

24. The Works of the late Reverend and Learned *John Owen*, D. D. some time Vice-Chancellor of the University of *Oxford*, and Dean of *Christ-Church*: Containing several scarce and valuable Discourses, *viz.* I. A Declaration of the glorious Mystery of the Person of Christ, being a direct Refutation of Arianism and Socinianism. II. Of Communion with God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. III. Of In-dwelling Sin in Believers. IV. Of Temptation; the Nature and Power of it. V. Of Mortification of Sin in Believers. VI. Of the Death of Christ, the Price he paid, and Purchase he made. With a Display of Arminianism. Publish'd in the Doctor's Life-time; and now collected together in One Volume; being

being very useful for Families. To which is prefixed the Doctor's Effigies curiously engraven. Recommended by several Learned and Judicious Divines.

25. An Essay concerning Certainty and Infallibility: or, Some Reflections upon a Pamphlet, stiled, The Nature and Consequences of Enthusiasm considered, in some short Remarks on the Doctrine of the Blessed Trinity stated and defended. In a Letter to the Author of those Remarks. By the Rev. Mr. *Samuel Fancourt*.

26. An Alarm to unconverted Sinners: In a serious Treatise. Shewing, I. What Conversion is not, and correcting some Mistakes about it. II. What Conversion is, and wherein it consisteth. III. The Necessity of Conversion. IV. The Marks of the Unconverted. V. The Miseries of the Unconverted. VI. Directions for Conversion. VII. Motives to Conversion. Whereunto are annexed divers Practical Cases of Conscience judiciously resolved. By *Joseph Allen*, late Minister of the Gospel at *Taunton* in *Somersetshire*.

27. Navigation Spiritualiz'd: Or, A new Compass for Seamen, consisting of XXXII Points, Of pleasant Observations, profitable Applications, and serious Reflections: All concluded with so many Spiritual Poems. Whereunto is now added, I. A sober Consideration of the Sin of Drunkenness. II. The Harlot's Face in the Scripture-Glass. III. The Art of Preserving the Fruits of the Lips. IV. The Resurrection of buried Mercies and Promises. V. The Seamen's Catechism. Being an Essay toward their much-desired Reformation from the horrible and detestable Sins of Drunkenness, Swearing, Uncleanness, Forgetfulness of Mercies, Violation of Promises, and Atheistical Contempt of Death. Fit to be seriously recommended to their Prophane Relations, whether Seamen or others, by all such as unfeignedly desire their eternal Welfare. By *John Flavel*, Minister of the Gospel. The Sixth Edition.